

Class 226 R

Book Ad 26

General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY

Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

127

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (I)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

London: FETTER LANE, E.C.

C. F. CLAY, MANAGER



Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET

Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS

New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.

Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (I)

BY

EDWIN A. ABBOTT

Honorary Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge
Fellow of the British Academy

Cambridge :
at the University Press

1913



226 R

A. b 26

66130

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

N 14 '19

RECEIVED OCT 10 1919
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PREFACE

THE three discussions contained in this treatise will be incorporated later on as Appendices in a volume that will form Section II of *The Fourfold Gospel* (Part X of *Diatessarica*). The first of the three, on "Nazarene" and "Nazoraean"—if its conclusion is correct—throws light on early Galilaean thought as filtering down from the Hebrew Scriptures, and on the reasons that have obscured its expression in Greek. It seemed to me that some who would not be disposed to read *Diatessarica* might be willing to glance at a study of this and one or two other special subjects.

The bracketed "I" in the title "*Miscellanea Evangelica (I)*" indicates that along with future parts of *The Fourfold Gospel*, I hope to publish parts of *Miscellanea* to illustrate them. I have had by me for many years classified parallelisms from the Evangelists illustrating their treatment of what may be called "*The Small Circumstances of the Gospels*," and it has often occurred to me that the publication of these, even without any comment, would be useful to an intelligent student for whom "a word is enough."

These "small circumstances" seem, some of them, very commonplace and uninteresting. What does it

matter, we may be inclined to ask, whether Jesus said or did this or that "*in a house*," as Mark (often alone in this respect) repeatedly tells us; or "*in a boat*," as Mark and Matthew say so often and Luke so seldom; or after "*returning*," as Luke alone tells us, repeatedly using a word that no other Evangelist uses; or that He did this or that "*across the Jordan*," or on "*the sea of Galilee*," both of which expressions Luke consistently avoids; or that Jesus "*looked round*," as Mark almost alone describes; or that He "*finished*" certain "words," "parables" &c., as Matthew, and Matthew alone, tells us in a kind of refrain?

I believe it "matters" a great deal in some of these and other apparently insignificant instances. We learn from many of them often much more than might be expected by those who are accustomed to explain phrases of this kind as though they were the "graphic detail" of a modern newspaper correspondent. What we learn varies. Sometimes we learn merely that the Evangelist dislikes this or that expression (as Luke dislikes "sea" of Galilee), and this does not take us very far. But at other times we are led back to traces of some tradition obscurely expressed by Mark, and omitted or altered by one or both of the two later Evangelists, Matthew and Luke.

In such cases, as has been shewn to some extent in the volume that forms the Introduction to The Fourfold Gospel, John often intervenes in order to explain or correct what was harsh or obscure in Mark. When this is so, we have, in effect, four first-century witnesses attesting with divergent evidence some

word or deed that has a pre-eminent claim to be regarded as proceeding from Christ; and thus a great discovery may arise out of the close examination of a classified group of little things.

Miscellanea (I), although it supplies some facts and classifications that may be useful to the reader in considering the Gospel use of the terms "Nazarene" and "Nazoraean," does not give much aid elsewhere in the shape of classified facts. I hope hereafter to do much more. Previous parts of *Diatessarica* have dealt abundantly, and sometimes superabundantly, with conjectures. Future parts, if published, will contain, I hope, much fewer conjectures, and many more references to classified facts that may remain, useful and used, long after most of the conjectures have passed into oblivion.

By publishing these Appendices to the book, in a cheap form, before the book itself, I hope to obtain some criticisms of my treatment of the difficult questions discussed in them which may enable me to correct anything that is erroneous or obscure before incorporating the discussions in the larger volume.

Besides obligations to other friends which I hope to acknowledge in the Preface of the completed volume, I desire here to specify my particular debt of thanks to Rev. G. Margoliouth, Senior Assistant in the Department of Oriental Printed Books and MSS at the British Museum, for revising the proofs of Chapter III on The Interpretation of early Christian Poetry, as to which I also received some valuable suggestions from my friend and former pupil, the

Rev. W. F. Lofthouse, M.A. The subject is, in some aspects, technical as well as difficult, and without the aid of an expert I should hardly have ventured to publish my views upon it.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

*Wellside, Well Walk,
Hampstead, N.W.
9 Sept. 1913.*

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
NAZARENE AND NAZORAEAN	I

CHAPTER II

THE DISCIPLE THAT WAS "KNOWN UNTO THE HIGH PRIEST"	18
---	----

CHAPTER III

THE INTERPRETATION OF EARLY CHRISTIAN POETRY	39
---	----

CHAPTER I

NAZARENE AND NAZORAEAN

IN this Chapter it will be argued that (i) "*Nazarene*," meaning a man of Nazareth, and (ii) "*Nazoraean*," meaning the *Nêtzet* or Rod of Jesse mentioned by Isaiah, were probably interchanged by a play on the two words ; so that the populace, acclaiming Jesus as the Lifegiver and Healer, altered "Jesus the Nazarene," into "Jesus the Nazoraean." To state the theory more exactly, we should say that they called Him Jesus the Nêtzet, or the Na(t)zoraean, partly because there was a pre-existing belief that the Messiah would be the Nêtzet, and partly because they vaguely felt what Matthew ventured definitely to express, that His residence from childhood onward in Nazareth had been ordained to fulfil the prophecy "He shall be called *Nazoraean* (i.e. *Nêtzet*)¹."

If this was the case, it would appear that "Nazarene²," a

¹ Mt. ii. 23. R.V. renders Ναζωραῖος sometimes "Nazarene" and sometimes "of Nazareth," but never by its exact form "Nazoraean."

² See Pliny v. 81 "Coele habet Apameam Marsya amne divisam a *Nazerinorum* tetrarchia," which suggests a field that ought to be explored by anyone entering into the question of the origin of "*Nazarene*." But it seems to have attracted very little notice. I am informed that nothing is known of these "*Nazerini*." Pliny is not referred to by *Encycl. Bib.* 3360 (where it is maintained that "'Nazareth' ought to mean 'Galilee'"), or by Hastings' *Dict.* iii. 496, or by Prof. Burkitt in his *Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names*, on which see footnote at the end of this Chapter. Strabo does not mention "*Nazerini*." Was Pliny misled by misunderstanding some reference (1) to the "cursing of Nazarenes" (see Schürer II. ii. 89) which had already reached his ears, or (2) to some pre-Christian Jewish sect like that which Epiphanius calls "Nasaraeans" (see below, p. 9)—which he took, in either case, as referring to some folk in the North of Palestine?

form used by Mark and Luke but not by Matthew and John, was an error, except in special contexts which may prove that the place-name, and not the Messianic title, was meant. It is proposed here to examine the Gospel uses of (i) "Nazarene," and (ii) "Nazoraean."

"Nazarene" occurs four times in Mark: (1) "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, Nazarene?" (where Matthew omits the whole story, and Luke follows Mark¹); (2) "having heard that it is Jesus the Nazarene²"; (3) "thou also wast with the Nazarene, [namely] Jesus³"; (4) "Jesus ye seek, the Nazarene, the crucified⁴."

It will be observed from the notes below that only in the first of these four instances is Mark followed by any other Evangelist. That instance occurs in a case of exorcism. The demoniac exclaims "Jesus, Nazarene," and "I know thee who thou art, [thou] the Holy One of God." "Nazarene" might be formed from the noun-form "Nazara" (used once by Matthew and once by Luke for the ordinary "Nazareth") a place not mentioned by Josephus or the Talmud and probably of small importance. It would appear to be a place-name that would suggest to many Jews, on first hearing it, the question "Where is it?" What are we to infer from its use here? Some such title as "Nazoraean," in a Messianic

¹ Mk i. 24 Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ (D Ναζαρηναί, d Nazorenae), Lk. iv. 34 Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ (D Ναζορηναί, d Nazarenae). Mk and Lk. agree *verbatim* in what follows: "I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God."

² Mk x. 47 W.H. marg. Ἰ. ἐστὶν ὁ Ναζαρηνὸς i.e., perhaps, "Jesus [namely] the Nazarene," Mt. xx. 30 ὅτι Ἰησοῦς παράγει, Lk. xviii. 37 ὅτι Ἰ. ὁ Ναζωραῖος (D Ναζαρηνός, but d Nazoraesus) παρέρχεται.

³ Mk xiv. 67 καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἦσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (the MSS vary as to order, D and d Ναζορηνου), Mt. xxvi. 69 "Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilaean," Lk. xxii. 56 "This man, too, was with him."

⁴ Mk xvi. 6 Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον (D om. τὸν Ναζαρηνόν), Mt. xxviii. 5 Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ζητεῖτε, Lk. xxiv. 5 "Why seek ye the living with the *dead*?" For *nétzer* = νεκρός, s. p. 10.

⁵ Mt. iv. 13, Lk. iv. 16. Elsewhere (Mt. twice, Mk once, Lk. 4 times, Jn twice, Acts once) it is Ναζαρέτ, or Ναζαρέθ.

sense, would seem more appropriate. Can it be that, when Jesus rose to sudden fame in Galilee, people began at once to play on the words "Nazarene" and "Nazoraean," and that the demoniac followed the popular cry, which Mark has wrongly rendered? An affirmative answer is suggested by the very few instances in the *Aboth* where a Rabbi is introduced with a birthplace-name or something different from the ordinary "son of so-and-so".¹

But before passing on to shew how the hypothesis of an original *Nétzer* might suit the facts, we must recognise that the play on the two words, *Nazara* and *Nétzer*, might be complicated, when passing into the first Greek Gospel, by a confusion with a third word, *Nazîr*, i.e. "Nazirite." This, in A.V., is always spelt with an *a*, incorrectly, "Nazarite." The *Onomastica Sacra* shews that Eusebius confused the three terms, *Nazara*, *Nétzer*, and *Nazîr*². Jerome, as we shall see,

¹ In the *Aboth*, Rabbis are very rarely introduced by any title except *ben* "son of," or *îsh* "man of." But there are at least the following exceptions: (i. 2) "Simeon *the Righteous*," (i. 7—8) "Matthai *the Arbêlî*," i.e. from a place called Arbela, (iii. 17) "R. Eliezer *the Modai*," i.e. from a place called Modai(m), (iii. 28) "R. Eleazar *Chasmah*" (Levy ii. 89 *b* "*Chisma*"), (iv. 16) "R. Jochanan *the Sandalar*," i.e. the maker (*or*, wearer) of sandals, (iv. 26) "Samuel *the Little*," (iv. 30) "R. Eliezer *the Kappura*" (Levy iv. 357 *a* "*the Cyprian*").

Some of these epithets or place-names are probably plays on words. *Arbela* (Levy i. 157 *b*) means "sieve"; "sandal" suggests that the Rabbi, besides being a sandal-maker, obeyed the Marcan precept (Mk vi. 9) "be shod with sandals" (s. *Corrections* 390 (ii) (ε) *a*); "*the Little*" might mean "the younger," but it is explained in *J. Sota* ix. 13 "because he made himself little"; "*the Cyprian*" (Levy iv. 357 *a*) may mean "the gum-seller" (in which I cannot see any allusive force); "*Modai*" (Levy iii. 42—3) is a form of the word "know," and (*Sabb.* 55 *b*) R. Gamaliel said "We always need *Modai* (knowledge), for Eleazar the [man] of *Modai(m)* (knowledge) said..." (Goldschm. "wir brauchen immer noch den *Modäer*," Levy "noch immer bedürfen wir des Ausspruches *des Modai*"); lastly "*Chisma*" (Levy ii. 89 *b*) is expressly said to have been so called because he had once been a dumb and, as it were, *muzzled* teacher, and became "*unmuzzled*."

² (1) *Náçap* (sic) is explained by Eusebius (see Index to *Onomastica*)

indicates that "*Nazirite*" was an early interpretation of Matthew's "*Nazoraean*." Tertullian, after quoting from Luke the cry of the demoniac "What have we to do with thee, Jesus! Art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God," and after saying that "a (or, the) prophet" had prophesied of "the Holy One of God²," and that "God's name of 'Jesus' was in the son of Nun," proceeds to explain "*Nazarene*" thus: "The Christ of the Creator had to be called *Nazaracus* according to prophecy; whence the Jews also designate us by that very name (ipso nomine) *Nazaraeans*, after Him. For indeed we are those about whom it is written '*Nazaraeans* are made whiter than snow³.'" Tertullian is quoting a passage in Lamentations rendered by A.V. "Her *Nazarites* were purer than snow⁴." He takes "*Nazarene*," in Luke, applied to Jesus, as meaning "*Nazirite*," and himself applies the term, in this sense, to the followers of Christ.

Obviously such an application could not long maintain itself against Jewish controversialists. It is true that the

as ἄνθος, (2) Ναζαπαῖοι (v.r. Ναζωραῖοι and Ναζαρινοί) as the ancient name of Christians, (3) Ναζαρέθ as (a) καθαρότης (b) ἄνθος ἀκραίφνης ἢ καθαρότης (c) the name from which Christ was called "Nazoraean," (4) Ναζαρέτ as ἀκρεμόνος (branch) αὐτοῦ ἢ καθαρός, (5) Ναζειραῖος as (a) ἅγιος (b) ἢ καθαρὸς (c) ἢ ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἀφωρισμένος θεοῦ, (6) Ναζηραῖος (v.r. Ναζωραῖος) as ἐξηγνισμένος, (7) Ναζωραῖος as (a) καθαρὸς (b) ἅγιος ἢ καθαρὸς (c) the name of Christ derived from Ναζαρέθ (adding καὶ Ναζαπαῖοι (sic) (v.r. Ναζωραῖοι and Ναζαρινοί) τὸ παλαιὸν ἡμεῖς οἱ νῦν Χριστιανοί).

These details shew that whereas (1) the root of *Nétzer* implies "flowering" or "growing," and (2) *Nazîr* implies "consecration," "purity," "separation (or, dedication) to God," &c., Eusebius oscillates between the two, with an additional occasional oscillation towards (3) "the town of Nazareth."

¹ Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* iv. 7. He omits "Nazarene" in the quotation, but proceeds to explain it in the next chapter, as though he had quoted it.

² Clark's translation suggests, as the prophecy, Ps. xvi. 10 "thine holy one," and Dan. ix. 24 R.V. txt "the most holy."

³ Tertull. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 8.

⁴ Lam. iv. 7 R.V. "her *nobles* (marg., 'or, *Nazirites*')."

term "Nazirite" was used with some latitude, as is shewn by the Jewish discussion whether Samuel could be called "a Nazirite"¹; and the Jewish and Syriac Versions of Ben Sira give Samuel this title². But in the face of Christ's own statement that "the Son of Man came eating and drinking"³, "Nazirite," applied to Christ, could hardly hold its ground. Nevertheless it is not only credible but even probable that Mark (whose Gospel does not contain the saying about "eating and drinking") is here recording unintelligently a tradition that called Jesus *Nazîr* instead of *Nétzer* and that took *Nazîr* to mean "holy one." "*Nazirite* (i.e. *Nazir*) of God" is twice rendered in the LXX "*holy [one] of God*"⁴. This does not indeed occur in any passage where "*the Holy One*" is used in its highest sense. It refers merely to Sampson. But it might easily combine with other causes to lead the earliest of the Evangelists into an error as to this difficult title. While explaining "thou *Nétzer*" as "thou *Nazarene*," Mark might naturally add—in accordance with his frequent habit of combining two interpretations⁵—"thou *Nazirite of God*" in the sense of "thou *holy one of God*."

It will be shewn hereafter that the influence of a familiar term like "*Nazirite*" (spelt with a *z*) might go even further than the influence of the name of an insignificant place like *Nazara*, to cause a substitution of *z* for *tz* in early Greek transliterations of *Nétzer*. But we now pass to the consideration of other passages in the Gospels testing the *Nétzer* hypothesis, beginning with the denials of Peter. In the first denial, where Mark has "Thou also wast with the Nazarene [namely] Jesus," Matthew has "Thou also wast with Jesus *the Galilaean*"⁶.

¹ See the Talmudic *Nazir* ix. 5 (Mishna).

² Sir. xlvi. 13 c "a Nazirite of the Lord in prophecy" (not in LXX), Syr. "a Nazirite in prophecy" (om. "of the Lord").

³ Mt. xi. 19, Lk. vii. 34.

⁴ Judg. xiii. 7 LXX ἅγιον θεοῦ, al. exempl. Ναζυραίων θεοῦ, rep. xvi. 17.

⁵ See *Clue* passim, and especially 128 foll.

⁶ Mk xiv. 67, Mt. xxvi. 69.

In the second denial, where Mark has "This [man] is [one] of them," Matthew has "This [man] was with Jesus *the Nazoraean*¹." If "Nazoraean," meaning *Nétzer*, was regularly used about Jesus by His Galilaean followers in Jerusalem, it would naturally be repeated by the Roman soldiers, and afterwards by Gentiles in general, as a mere place-name—"Nazoraean" being regarded by Mark and other Greek writers as an inaccurate form of "Nazarene."

"Nazoraean" occurs in all the Gospels except Mark, and still more frequently in the Acts². But it does not occur in the LXX nor in Greek literature apart from Christian influence. Matthew says (1) that "Nazoraean" was connected with residence in "Nazareth," but also (2) that the residence was ordained in order to fulfil a prophecy about "Nazoraean"—which is not a form of "Nazareth." His words give us the impression of an early play on words by which Christ's disciples converted some form of "Nazareth" or "Nazara" into some word used in prophecy to denote the Messiah: "He [*i.e.* Joseph] came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, that 'he shall be called *Nazoraean*'³."

Jerome, in his commentary on Matthew, gives two explanations of this. One is, that "Nazaraeus" means "holy," and that all the Scriptures declare that the Lord will be holy. Another is, that there is a reference to Isaiah's mention of "Jesse" and "a *branch* out of his roots⁴." In his commentary on Isaiah he goes further: "That expression [as to] which, in the Gospel of Matthew, *all ecclesiastical writers seek, and cannot find* where it is written 'that he shall be called (?) *Nazoraean*'

¹ Mk xiv. 69, Mt. xxvi. 71. Lk. xxii. 58 has "Thou also art [one] of them." R.V. nowhere renders "Nazoraean" literally, see p. 1, n. 1.

² Mt. ii. 23, xxvi. 71, Lk. xviii. 37, Jn xviii. 5—7, xix. 19 (Acts 7 times, including xxii. 8 "I am Jesus *the Nazoraean*").

³ Mt. ii. 23 ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται.

⁴ Is. xi. 1.

(Lat. text *Nazaraeus*), 'learned men among the Hebrews think to be taken from this passage.' He goes on to say that the peculiar sound of the Hebrew נ, (*tz*) in *ntzr*, "branch," being between *s* and *z*, cannot be expressed in Latin.

The hypothesis of this allusion gives us a reasonable explanation of the term "Nazoraean," if it was a Messianic name, derived from Isaiah, "And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a *branch* (*nétzer*) out of his roots shall bear fruit." The Targum paraphrases "*branch*" as Messiah thus: "And there shall go forth a king from the sons of Jesse and a *Messiah* from his sons' sons shall be anointed [as prince]." It ought not to surprise us if, among many Messianic names in the first century, that of the Branch of the Tree of Jesse, the Prince of the House of David, the symbol of the Kingdom of Peace, became familiar and popular, so that the Messiah might be hailed as *Nétzer*, along with the more prosaic and ordinary title "Son of David."

The name "Jesse" is associated with old age¹. There was a picturesque paradox in the history of the old man's youngest son, a mere stripling, overlooked at first among his brothers, and coming unexpectedly to the rescue of Israel from the Philistines. No wonder that the story suggested to the poets and prophets of his people the thought of a branch springing out of the root of a tree decaying and almost dead. In later times, when the tree of the house of David had suffered grievously from foreign conquerors, it was natural that Isaiah, after predicting that the Lord would "lop the boughs with terror," should refer to the "branch" from "Jesse" in his comforting prophecy, "And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him²."

¹ I S. xvii. 12 (R.V.) "the man was an old man in the days of Saul stricken [in years] among men."

² Is. xi. 1—2.

Philo appears to refer to this passage when he says, not long after quoting Isaiah about Israel as being once childless and desolate, but now a mother of many children¹, that "when the trunk is cut down, but the roots not taken away, *new shoots spring up* by which the old decrepit tree is surpassed²." It may be the same, he says, in mankind. Wherever a small seed of virtue is left, it may become a source of all that is best and most glorious, through which desolate cities are once more inhabited, and nations advance in population. This is his philosophic and impersonal and abstract way of saying what Galilaeans would express by avowing their faith in the "Branch" from the aged Jesse, who would "assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah," and stand for "an ensign of the peoples, unto whom the nations shall seek³."

That "Jesse" was the subject of Jewish mystical thought at an early time appears from Chronicles, where his name is spelt so as to make it identical with "man"—"vir, potens robore," says Rashi⁴. *Sota* goes further. It fastens on the warlike meaning of "man" and ignores "Jesse." Instead of saying that "David son of [a] man [that was an] Ephrathite⁵" might have two meanings, 1st, son of Jesse who was called "man" (*vir*), and 2nd, "son of God," since God is "a man of war⁶," it gives the second meaning alone. Probably there were in the first century very many legends about Jesse of which only a few survive⁷.

¹ Philo ii. 434—5 quoting Is. liv. 1.

² *Ib.* ii. 437 alluding to Is. xi. 1.

³ Is. xi. 12, 10.

⁴ 1 Chr. ii. 13. The passage also spells "David" "*plene cum yod propter honorem Davidis*," and omits "Elihu," so as to make David the seventh son instead of the eighth.

⁵ 1 S. xvii. 12. R.V. omits "man."

⁶ *Sota* 42 b quoting Exod. xv. 3.

⁷ See *Berach.* 58 a about Jesse as being one who always moved "with a multitude," a legend arising from 1 S. xvii. 12 (*lit.*) "went among men," Rashi "numerabatur in coetu virorum honoratorum," Targ. (Walton) "*juvenibus*," LXX "*men*" but *v.r.* "*years*."

The early evidence from Chronicles bearing on the spelling of Jesse's name gives somewhat more importance than might be otherwise attached to the curious statement of Epiphanius about "Jessaeans," as an early name for Christians. It deserves mention here as it bears on the meaning and spelling of "Nazoraean."

Epiphanius says that all Christians (before they were called Christians at Antioch) were called "Nazoraean," and indeed, "for a short time, Jessaeans." The Jessaeans he there regards as deriving their name from Jesse¹. But, later on, he suggests that the Jessaeans may have derived their name either from Jesse, or from Jesus as meaning Healer or Saviour². He identifies them with those whom Philo calls Essaeans (known to us as Essenes) some of whom accepted Jesus as Messiah, from whom—as being conceived in the womb at Nazareth, and hence called "Jesus the Nazoraean," they called themselves *Nazoraean*³. Finally, he says, "But it was a different sect that called themselves *Nasaraean*; for the sect of the *Nasaraean* was before Christ and did not know Christ⁴."

While making these startling statements Epiphanius does not quote Isaiah. Nor does he seem to have perceived that such sects might naturally derive their names from the "Nêtzar" of Jesse mentioned by Isaiah. But his testimony is of all the more value. For it shews that he is not inventing facts, or adapting facts to a theory of his own derived from the text of Isaiah. He is merely enumerating and describing (what he believes to have been) Jewish and Christian sects. Among the most ancient of these he finds (1) "*Nazoraean*," connected with "Jesse," and (2) a still earlier sect "before Christ," called "*Nasaraean*." If there were such sects, or early traditions

¹ *Haer.* xxix, p. 116 foll.

² *Ib.* p. 120.

³ *Ib.* pp. 120—1.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 121 "Ἄλλοι δὲ Ναζαραῖοι ἑαυτοὺς ἐκάλουν. The ἄλλοι appears to be emphatic: "it was others."

mentioning such names, it must occur to every one that the names had some connection with Isaiah's mention of the *Nétzer* of *Jesse*.

Against these views it may be urged that the Talmud knows nothing of such a Jewish sect, or of such a Messianic name. But the Talmudic silence, under the circumstances, would prove little. The Talmudists would naturally be silent about a Jewish sect, or a Messianic title in Scripture, that had originated a term fraught with such sinister associations to their nation, as "Nazoraean" and the kindred "Nazarene."

There is a trace, however, of allusion to "Nazoraean," if connected with *nétzer*, in a story about a heretic called *Nétzer*, one of five disciples of Jesus, put to death for heresy. He pleaded for his life, on the ground of the favourable mention of "the branch" ("*branch* of *Jesse*") in Isaiah. But he was answered by another text of Isaiah mentioning "an abominable *branch*," where LXX has "corpse" for "*branch*." He was told that he was the latter, and must be killed¹.

So far as it goes, the evidence of the Talmud favours the derivation from "branch" rather than from *Nazara*. For it calls Jesus (or His followers) *Nétzeri*. This does not resemble *Nazara*. But it closely resembles a form of "branch" (*Nétzer*) extant in the text of Ben Sira, "*The branch* of violence shall not be unpunished²." And it is easy to believe that the Jews parodied a form of *Nétzer*, to distinguish the Branch of the

¹ See Levy iii. 431 *b* quoting *Sanhedr.* 43 *a* which plays on Is. xi. 1, xiv. 19. To the Jewish mind, regarding Israel as the Vine of the Lord, the Messiah might seem to be not only a Branch from the roots of Jesse but also a Branch from the roots of the Vine. To Christians the Messiah seemed the Vine itself. Yet the thought of "David" as the Branch seems merged with the thought of David, and David's Son the Messiah, as the Vine, in *Didach.* § 9 "We give thee thanks, our Father, for the *holy vine* of David." On "corpse" for "branch" see p. 17 n.

² Sir. xl. 15, Gesen. 666 *a*. The margin drops the *ô*. It is also dropped in *Ben Nétzer* (referring to Dan. vii. 8 "a little horn" (*Gen. r.* on Gen. xxxii. 11, Wü. p. 374)).

Christians from that true *Nétzer* of Jesse which God might call "the *branch* of my planting¹."

According to this view, "the Nazoraean," in the mouths of the peasants and fishermen of Galilee, meant the Prince of the House of Jesse, or David, who was to "judge the poor with righteousness," and to bring about a reign of universal peace; and hence, whenever we find in a Gospel an appeal to the "Son of David" or a mention of "Son of David," we ought not to be surprised if some parallel Gospel has "Nazoraean." Jesus came, literally, from Nazareth or Nazara. But the people that acclaimed Him would say in their hearts "Not Nazarene, but Nazoraean," and their tongues would repeat only the latter. A literalistic Evangelist like Mark might feel bound to give the place-name literally, but he would not express the popular feeling.

Conveying, as it does, the notion of a "shoot," growing up from the root of Jesse into life and vigour, "Nazoraean," if meaning *nétzer*, would suggest to all Jews thoughts of strengthening, healing, revivification, and resurrection. Peter's first proclamation of the gospel begins with it: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: *Jesus the Nazoraean*"—going on to describe His resurrection from death as predicted by David His ancestor, and His establishment as "both Lord and

¹ Is. lx. 21. On *ha-Nôtzri* applied to Jesus, see *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (R. T. Herford) p. 52 n. "It is well known that the name of Nazareth does not occur in the Talmud, and indeed first appears in Jewish writings so late as the hymns of Qalir (A.D. 900 *circa*), in the form Nätzerath. This is probably the correct Hebrew form; but there must have been another form, Nötzerath, or Nötzerah, to account for the adjective Nötzri."

Since this form "Nötzerath," which "must have been" in existence, if we are "to account for the adjective Nötzri," cannot be found, it is natural to look in some other direction for an origin of *Nôtzri*, as being "the Branch" in a bad sense, like "the abominable branch," or "the branch of violence."

For an illustrative parallel, see Schürer I. ii. 298 on the late Jewish interpretation of Bar-Cosiba, whom Akiba had called "*star*," as "*deceiver*

Messiah¹." Peter's first act of healing is also introduced with it, "In the name of *Jesus Christ, the Nazoraean*, walk." This is followed by a proclamation of Jesus as "the Prince of life whom God raised from the dead," and, later on, by the declaration, "In the name of *Jesus Christ, the Nazoraean*, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, doth this man stand here before you whole²." In all these passages, and still more perhaps in one of the accounts of Paul's conversion containing the words "I am *Jesus the Nazoraean*, whom thou persecutest," most readers—if they approach these stirring announcements with a desire to realise them as if hearing them for the first time—will feel (I think) that there would be something flat in the mention of "the Nazoraean" if it only meant "born at Nazara"—a name suggesting "Where is it?"—but that it would sound an inspiriting and stirring note if it also alluded to "the ever living Prince of Life, the Nêtzer, the Branch of the Lord's Planting³."

As regards the Gospels, most of the instances in the Synoptic tradition have been mentioned above⁴; and it

¹ Acts ii. 22—36. Acts ii. 1—21 introduces, but does not proclaim the gospel.

² Acts iii. 6—15, iv. 10.

³ Acts xxii. 8. Between this and the Petrine instances comes Acts vi. 14 "We have heard him [*i.e.* Stephen] say that this Jesus, the *Nazoraean* [as these heretics call him] (*ὁτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος*) will destroy this place." The other instances in the Acts are xxiv. 5 "a ringleader of the sect of the *Nazoraeans*," and xxvi. 9 "contrary to the name of Jesus the *Nazoraean*." "Nazarene" does not occur in the Greek of the Acts (in spite of xxiv. 5 R.V. "Nazarenes," as to which see p. 1, n. 1).

⁴ No mention has been made of an instance peculiar to Luke, in the story of Emmaus (xxiv. 19) "the things concerning Jesus *the Nazarene*." It is the only instance of "Nazarene" in Luke (apart from Lk. iv. 34 where he closely follows Mark). Possibly Luke simply retains the form used in a narrative that he incorporates in his Gospel. But it would have a distinctive meaning if it implied that the two disciples had, for the moment, given up their Messianic hopes, and that Jesus, whom they would but recently have called "*the Nazoraean*, the Branch of the Lord's planting," had, for the moment, become to them simply "*the Nazarene*," beloved and longed for, but only as "*Jesus of Nazareth*."

should be added that an insertion peculiar to Matthew, immediately after the Riding into Jerusalem, mentions "prophet" and "from Nazareth," whereas the other three Gospels mention "king" or "kingdom" in the preceding welcome of Jesus, but Matthew does not¹. In John, "Jesus *the Nazoraean*" is the reply twice made by the cohort and the servants of the chief priests to the question asked by Jesus, "Whom seek ye?" Jesus makes, and confirms, the avowal that He *is* "Jesus *the Nazoraean*" ("I am he"). A little afterwards Pilate writes on the Cross "Jesus *the Nazoraean*, the King of the Jews," and confirms it with "What I have written I have written." The Fourth Gospel gives us the impression that the whole of the inscription was written by Pilate as God's instrument. The Synoptists do not insert in it "Jesus *the Nazoraean*." Mark has simply "the King of the Jews." Matthew and Luke add "this" or "this is Jesus³." What Pilate understood by "Nazoraean" we are not told. Whatever it meant, the accused had been arrested under that appellation, and would be consistently tried and executed under it, whether it meant to Romans "of the town of Nazara" (as it probably did) or "commonly called Nazoraean." But John, by making Pilate write on the Cross "Jesus *the Nazoraean*," along with "King of the Jews," certainly succeeds in conveying the impression that Providence was giving a royal glory to the former title.

From this, the last Johannine instance of "Nazoraean," let us return to the Johannine introduction of "Nazareth" in the dialogue between Philip and Nathanael, in which the latter objects to Nazareth as the Messiah's birthplace and yet

¹ Mt. xxi. 11; comp. Mk xi. 10, Lk. xix. 38, Jn xii. 13 "king" (or "kingdom"), Mt. xxi. 9 om. "king."

² Jn xviii. 5, 7.

³ Mk xv. 26; Mt. xxvii. 37 οὗτός ἐστιν ἰ. ὁ β. τῶν Ἰουδαίων; Lk. xxiii. 38 ὁ β. τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος.

accepts Jesus in spite of the objection. In the case of Philip it might well be said that the objection to "Nazareth," as the Messianic home, appeared to be not met but overridden. Are we to suppose that it was "overridden" in the case of Nathanael also? The context suggests that there may be another explanation.

It is liable to the charge of being "subtle." But it is at all events in accordance with all the facts enumerated above. In particular, it accords with the Matthaean tradition (as interpreted from Isaiah) that the residence in Nazareth was ordained in order that Jesus "might be called *the Branch*," *i.e.* the Prince of the House of David, and the Branch of God's planting. It is this—that Nathanael, an "Israelite without guile" and also learned in the Scriptures, being forced by the power of Christ's personality to receive Him as the Messiah, and yet being at the same time told that He is "from *Nazareth*," is driven at once to the same conclusion as that set forth by Matthew, namely, that the connection of the Messiah with the village of *Nazareth* was ordained "in order that He might be called *Nétzer*."

Historically and logically Nathanael's exclamation is unjustifiable. He ought (we may say) to have waited for fuller information. Then he would have ascertained that Jesus was born in Bethlehem—which was either (as Matthew implies) the home, or (as Luke says) the lodging-place, of Joseph and Mary at the time of the birth. But the Synoptic Gospels give us no hint that the birth at Bethlehem was publicly known during Christ's life. The Fourth Gospel goes further. It gives us reasons for confidently asserting that it was *not* publicly known. It represents objections—raised by some of "the multitude," and also by "the Pharisees," that the Christ or "the Prophet¹" could not come "out of Galilee"—as being

¹ Jn vii. 52. On the necessity of this interpretation see *Johannine Grammar* 2492.

allowed to pass uncontradicted. In both cases, supporters of Jesus are present. Some of them had said before "This is the Christ." But they have nothing to say now. Nicodemus pleads for Christ, but when they fling in his face "Art thou also of Galilee?" he leaves the gibe unanswered¹.

Putting ourselves in the position of Nathanael, convinced that Jesus must be the Messiah, and also that He was "from Nazareth," and knowing nothing of the alleged birth at Bethlehem, could we, as Jews, with Jewish ways of interpreting Scripture, find a much better refuge—for the moment at all events—than the assumption that, if Jesus was indeed "from Nazareth," it was divinely ordained, in order that He might be "called Nazoraean," that is to say, the Branch, who was at once the Son of God and the Son of Israel?

In concluding our consideration of this very difficult question we shall do well to remember that in the transition of Christian tradition from the language of the East to that of the West, it would be natural to introduce into the former a definiteness that was not part of the original. Birthplace-names such as "the Stagirite" would not suggest to a Greek a metaphorical or mystical interpretation, or anything but plain "Aristotle." But Abram *the Hebrew*—the first mention of "Hebrew" in the Bible—is rendered by LXX as meaning that "Hebrew" was "the Crosser, or Passer, Over." R. Jehuda, commenting on this passage, implies that the Patriarch "*passed over*" from the world of falsehood to the world of truth, and Philo takes the same view². Also "Elijah *the Tishbite*" is taken by the author of *Horae Hebraicae* as alluding to the mission of Elijah to be "the Converter³."

¹ Jn vii. 41—2, 52.

² *Light on the Gospel* 3948 foll.

³ See *Hor. Heb.* iii. 21 (on Lk. i. 17). He adds that "the Targum and other Rabbins would have it from the city *Toshab*." But it is difficult to believe that there was not found in "*Toshab*" some allusion to the Prophet's task.

Even those who took Tishbite to mean "from Toshab" might admit that the prophet's birthplace-name was, as it were, a prophecy of the "conversion" that was to be the prophet's work. And that thoughts of this kind extended to the use of birthplace-names in the earliest traditions of the Talmud is indicated by the instances given above from *Aboth*. This general consideration should go a long way toward convincing us that Jesus was called "the Nazoraean," not "the Nazarene," by His disciples, and that Mark, in substituting the latter for the former, has committed a natural but a serious error¹.

¹ Professor Burkitt in the course of some valuable remarks about Nazareth &c. in *Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names* (published for the British Academy, 1912) says p. 18 "It seems to me most probable that the word is really connected with נזיר and the vow of the Nazirites," adding "It is a desperate conjecture, and I would not make it, were it not that *the ordinary view of Nazareth seems to me wholly unproved and unsatisfactory.*" With the words that I have italicised I heartily agree: but he adds "And the most unproved and least satisfactory part of the ordinary view is that part of it which is attested by the Syriac Versions, whereby the *z* is made to represent a Semitic *צ*." From this I venture to differ for the reasons given above, maintaining that the Syriac has preserved the original "Semitic *צ*" which belonged to *Nêtzer*.

No doubt, Professor Burkitt is right in saying (p. 28 foll.) that the Semitic *צ* is rarely represented by the Greek ζ. Yet he himself points out that "Zoar" (the name of the city near the Dead Sea, where Lot took refuge) is an exception, and he indicates the reasons. (1) It was a well-known place and spelt Ζοάρα or Ζωάρα by Ptolemy. (2) It was supposed to mean "Little-borough." Now "little" is spelt in Hebrew with *צ* (*tz*) but in Aramaic with *z*. He adds that "though *ז* and *צ* do not indiscriminately or regularly interchange, yet one or two roots containing these letters do interchange, and זער-צער is one."

Here he does not go so far as Levy in recognising the likelihood of interchange of *צ* and *ז*. Levy *Ch. i.* 209 says that the Aramaic *ז* is "often" interchanged with similar sibilants, "especially" *z* and *tz* ("ז and צ"), and gives an instance a little later (*ib.* 214 *b*) where the Hebrew ציריה "viaticum," has passed into the Aramaic זורא. If Levy is right as to this frequency of interchange, it becomes much more easy to understand how the Hebrew *nêtzer* might pass into the early Christian Church in a form that substituted *z* for *tz*. That Jewish Christians ever called

Christ "a Nazirite" seems to me in the highest degree improbable, both because Christ's manner of life was alien from such a title, and because the title had no Messianic traditions; but that the term "Nazirite"—interpreted as "the consecrated one" or "holy one of God"—was one of several causes that led Gentile Christians to misunderstand a Jewish play on the titles "Jesus *the Nêtzer*" and "Jesus of Nazara," seems very probable indeed.

In particular, there are the following grounds for believing that "Jesus the *Nêtzer*" would be a controversial phrase, in the first half of the first century, between Jews and Christians in disputes concerning the Resurrection of Christ. (1) According to Matthew (xxviii. 15), the Jews persistently accused the Christians of stealing the body of Jesus from the sepulchre. [According to John (xx. 2) the women for a short time believed that it had been "taken away" by others ("they").] (2) The Jewish accusers would probably apply to such a Christian theft, even though they somewhat strained the verbal prophecy, the words of Isaiah (xiv. 19) "cast forth from thy sepulchre like an abominable *nêtzer*, as the raiment of those that are slain, that are thrust through with the sword." (3) Here the LXX has "dead (*νεκρός*)" for *nêtzer*, and Aquila and Symmachus have *ἰχώρ* and *ἔκτρομα*, implying that the body was a mangled mass of flesh and blood. (4) We have seen above (p. 10) that, according to the Talmud, the Jews used Isaiah's words to justify them in killing a certain *Nêtzer*, a Christian heretic. (5) Isaiah's preceding context (xiv. 13) "I will ascend (*ἀναβήσομαι*) into heaven" was applied ironically to Jesus Himself (*Notes on New Testament Criticism* 2998 (xviii) a) by Rabbi Abbahu (about 280 A.D.). (6) Both passages of Isaiah were referred by the Jews primarily to Nebuchadnezzar, whose pride made him boast of "ascending" to heaven, and whose apprehended resurrection from the dead caused his enemies to "thrust-through" his corpse "with the sword." From the Jewish point of view, a secondary application to Jesus was very natural. (7) On the other hand, concerning the true *nêtzer*, the *nêtzer* from the root of Jesse, the LXX—calling it "a flower"—said (Is. xi. 1) "a flower from the root shall ascend (*ἀναβήσεται*, but Heb. *lit.* 'bear-fruit')." (8) Where Mark (xvi. 6) has "ye seek Jesus the Nazarene, the crucified," the parallel Luke (xxiv. 5) has "why seek ye the living with the dead (*νεκρῶν*)?"

The facts suggest that the tradition on which Mark was based contained some contrast between the true and the false "*nêtzer*" to this effect: "Ye are seeking the [living and growing] *nêtzer* as [if He were the *nêtzer*] *thrust-through* [and helpless among the dead]." If so, Mark has retained *nêtzer* as "Nazarene" and "*thrust-through*" as "crucified." Luke has retained neither word, but has given something approaching to the sense of both.

CHAPTER II

THE "DISCIPLE" THAT WAS (R.V.) "KNOWN UNTO THE HIGH PRIEST"¹

THE Fourth Gospel differs from the Three in representing Peter's denial as being the result, in part at all events, of an action proceeding not from himself, but from another—an unnamed person. According to this Gospel, though Peter followed Jesus to the High Priest's palace, he remained standing at the door outside². It was natural that he should desire to learn the issue of the trial of Jesus as soon as possible, and this he could do by waiting—probably with others who had not the right of entry—outside the palace. Inside, he could do Jesus no good, and his presence there (as he must have well known) would expose him to great peril. It would also, if he

¹ Jn xviii. 15—16 (R.V.) "And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and [so did] another disciple. Now that disciple was known unto the high priest, and entered in with Jesus into the court of the high priest; but Peter was standing at the door without. So the other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, went out and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter." R.V. is not quite accurate. See below, pp. 24—5, n. 6 (*ad fin.*), and p. 27, n. 1.

² The Evangelist apparently assumes that there was one and the same αὐλὴ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, "courtyard of the High Priest," for Caiaphas and Annas, so that the latter occupied separate chambers from the official chambers of Caiaphas, but had no separate "courtyard." He assumes (and no doubt rightly) that the proceedings of the trial were irregular, and makes this clear at the outset by saying that the prisoner was taken "first" to "Annas"; who had no official position. To avoid the hypothesis of a change of scene from one courtyard to the other, and for other reasons, some early authorities have made transpositions of the text, *e.g.* SS arranges consecutively Jn xviii. 13, 24, 14, 15, 19—23, 16—18, 25 &c.

was arrested, prevent him from carrying word to the rest of the disciples and to the anxious women about the fate of their Master.

But some one came out of the palace and, in effect, brought Peter in. Nonnus, one of our earliest authorities for the interpretation of this passage, says that he "*took*" Peter "*by the hand*," and "brought him in." But the present text of the Gospel says, ambiguously, either that he spoke to the portress and *also* brought Peter in, or that he spoke to the portress, and *she* brought Peter in. Our Revised Version prefers the former, Chrysostom the latter. In either case one can see that Peter could hardly refuse the invitation. Doubtless, to accept it involved a tremendous future risk; but to refuse it involved an immediate cowardice. The unnamed disciple said, in effect, to Peter, "Do you not want to know, as I do, what they will do to the Master? You must want it. Then come in." This almost amounted to "*taking Peter by the hand and leading him in*¹."

The question for us is, "Who thus, in effect, drew Peter into the net of temptation?" It is generally taken for granted that it was John the son of Zebedee. Chrysostom assumes this. So does Jerome. But Chrysostom, as we shall see, slightly alters the text of the Gospel so as to favour his view, and Jerome does not represent the Greek exactly. The reason for assuming it appears to be mainly this, that, later on, in connection with Peter, "*the other disciple whom Jesus loved*" undoubtedly means John; and here, in connection with Peter, the text mentions "*another disciple*," afterwards referred to as "*the other disciple*." It is perhaps natural, at first sight, to infer that "*other disciple*" when mentioned with "Peter" means John in the earlier instance because it certainly means John in the later.

¹ See below, p. 25, n. 3. Nonnus perhaps meant "taking by the hand" to imply a guarantee that the "other disciple" knew Peter. But Peter might feel the action to be, in effect, coercive.

But does it not make a difference that whereas, later on, the "*other disciple*" is called the one "*whom Jesus loved*," here the "*other disciple*" is described as (R.V. twice) "*known unto the high priest*"? Will it not make a still greater difference if we presently find (as we shall) that the phrase rendered by R.V. in the second instance "*known unto the high priest*" really means "*intimate friend*," and implies "*the friend that was in his counsels*"? For the Gospel says, in the very verse that precedes, "Now Caiaphas was *he that gave counsel to the Jews that it was expedient that one man should die for the people*." Is it likely that a Gospel written in the name of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" should say, in effect, that that disciple was "in the counsels of" the High Priest who was plotting the death of Jesus—and this on the very eve of His crucifixion?

And are there not also some *a priori* grounds for doubting whether the action assigned to the unnamed disciple is quite suitable to John? We generally think of him as thoughtful, retiring, and less impulsive than Peter. On the shore of Gennesaret, John does not swim to Jesus. He merely says to Peter "It is the Lord." It is Peter who plunges in. But here what are we to say about the conduct of this unnamed disciple in the palace of Caiaphas? To bring Peter—we may almost say with Nonnus, to "take Peter by the hand and draw him"—into a crowd of the High Priest's guards and servants¹, where he, the single one of the Twelve who had been bold enough to strike a blow for his Master, could not possibly escape notice, followed by suspicious questioning, and ultimately by detection! It may have been well intended, but was it wise and thoughtful? And when it was done, when Peter was inside, left like a hunted creature at bay amid his enemies,

¹ It has been suggested that others, attracted by curiosity, may have pressed into the courtyard, among whom Peter might have, for a time, escaped notice. That may be granted as not improbable. And it would diminish the immediate risk. But even so, the risk would be so great as to make Peter's entry explicable only by very special circumstances.

was it thoughtful or kind to desert him without a word or act of recorded helpfulness?

It may be said, "John was engaged in a higher duty. He was in the upper room, watching the trial of his Lord." But would his Lord have preferred this? Are we quite sure that He would have called it a "higher duty"? Even if John had spoken in the Lord's defence, Jesus might perhaps have preferred that he should be defending his brother disciple in his struggles with Satan who was "sifting him like wheat." But to be above and to do nothing, when he might have been below, helping the brother Apostle, whom, by his own impulsive conduct, he had plunged into temptation—was this the kind of conduct that we should expect in the disciple whom Jesus specially loved?

These considerations, it is hoped, may bespeak a patient hearing for the suggestion—not, I believe, quite novel¹, but,

¹ Alford *ad loc.* says "There is no reason to doubt the universal persuasion that by this name John intends *himself*....The idea that it was *Judas Iscariot* (Heumann), is surely too absurd to need confutation. The [ὁ] ἄλλος, συνεισ. τῷ Ἰησ., ἣν γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχ. (as a matter of individual notice), and the whole character of the incident, will prevent any real student of St John's style and manner from entertaining such a supposition for a moment."

Keim (*Jesus of Nazara* vi. 58) says "Foolish explanations of the 'other disciple' as an unknown person (Aug., Calov, Gurlitt), as a citizen of Jerusalem (Grotius), even as Iscariot (Heum.)." The sentence finishes here. I am informed that Meyer's *Gospel of John* Vol. II. p. 311, adds "Calovius and Calvin" to Augustine and Grotius, as givers of what Keim calls "foolish explanations," and as exceptions to what Alford calls "the universal persuasion."

Westcott, after remarking that the text has *another disciple*, not *the other*, says "The reader cannot fail to identify the disciple with St John." This may give to some readers, who do not "fail," a sense of their own superiority to Augustine, Grotius, and Calvin. But others, who do "fail," may be consoled by feeling that they fail with eminent men.

These three quotations appear to shew that the Judas-hypothesis has not yet received attention from "any real student of St John's style and manner" in this country.

See *Son of Man* 3460 c for an attempt to explain "*the High Priest*" (in

as far as I know, not hitherto presented for serious consideration in this country—that the unnamed disciple was not John but Judas Iscariot, and that this subtle, perhaps we must say this over subtle, Evangelist intended us to distinguish “*another disciple who was the friend of the High Priest*” from one whom he will describe later on as the “*other disciple whom Jesus loved*.” Both disciples are connected in a peculiar way with Peter. But the former, whatever may have been his motives, acted as Peter’s enemy. The latter acted as Peter’s friend. The first Johannine mention of Judas Iscariot followed a confession of Simon Peter, and was accompanied by the word “devil”; and the context implied that Judas was then acting like an instrument of Satan and endeavouring to lead Peter and the rest of the disciples astray, following after Satan¹. Now, in the High Priest’s palace, consistently with his previous attempt to mislead Peter, Judas attempts again, and on this occasion succeeds. He actually leads the foremost of the Apostles to deny his Lord. This is the work of the “*other*” *disciple who was the friend of the High Priest*.

How different the influence on Peter of the “*other*” *disciple whom Jesus loved*! He accompanies Peter to the tomb of the Lord, and outstrips him in the race. Judas drew Peter into the hall of Caiaphas, the House of Temptation. John indirectly, by emulation, stimulated Peter to go before him into the tomb of Jesus, which was the preparatory House of Faith. Later on, again, it was “that disciple whom Jesus loved” who “saith unto Peter, It is the Lord,” and Peter “girt his coat about him—for he was naked—and cast himself into the sea.” It seems to be implied that Peter reached Jesus before the rest of the disciples reached Him. If he did, it was thanks to “that disciple whom Jesus loved.”

“known to *the High Priest*”) as a name given in Christian tradition to Jesus.

¹ Jn vi. 68—71, on which see in *The Fourfold Gospel, Introduction* p. 146, the section entitled “Attraction and recoil, Peter and Judas.”

Reviewing all these facts, can we not imagine that the Fourth Evangelist may have meant antithesis where we have taken him to mean identity? "How could you suppose"—he might perhaps say to us, complaining of our dulness of comprehension—"that I intended you to identify *another disciple who was the bosom friend of Caiaphas, the murderer of Jesus, with the other disciple whom Jesus loved?*" And this, at least, might be said in support of such a complaint, that the Johannine narrative does make the action of the unnamed disciple responsible for what followed. If the friend of the High Priest had not taken Peter into the High Priest's hall, Peter—humanly speaking—would not have denied his Master.

Passing now to an examination of the Johannine context mentioning the disciple that was a friend of the High Priest, we must be prepared to find the text varying a great deal and possibly corrupt. The points of main interest in it are emphasized in the early poetic commentary of Nonnus. For example, he repeats the thought of being "well known," in *three different meanings*, in one line thus:—(1) "[intimately] known," (2) "renowned," (3) "accustomed"¹. A literal translation of his paraphrase of the passage may perhaps usefully prepare the reader for the difficulties of the Gospel text. Usually Nonnus agrees with Chrysostom, but in this passage they differ widely. The extract covers the ground from Peter's entrance up to the question that elicits the first of the three denials²:—

¹ For instances of such repetition called "conflation," see *Clue* 113—27.

² Jn xviii. 15—17, paraphrased by Nonnus xviii. 69—80. The Greek is as follows:

Ἰησοῦν δὲ φέροντες ἐπέρρεον ἀσπιδιώται·
καὶ οἱ ὀπισθοκέλευθος ὁμάρτεε τηλόθι Σίμων
καὶ νέος ἄλλος ἐταῖρος, ὃς ἰχθυόλου παρὰ τέχνης
γνωτὸς ἔων ἀρίδης ἐθήμονος ἀρχιερέως
Χριστῷ σύνδρομος ἦλθεν ἕσω θεοδέγμονος αὐλῆς.
καὶ βραδὺς αὐτόθι Πέτρος ἐλείπετο νόσφι θυράων.

So, bearing Jesus [with them] the spearmen flowed on,
 And on His track went with them afar off Simon
 And a young [man]¹ another companion [of Christ]—who, from
 his trade of fishing²,
 Being a friend³, renowned, of the (?) accustomed⁴ high priest,
 Running-with Christ, came within the God-receiving courtyard;
 And, tardy⁵, there where he was, Peter was left, away from the
 portals.
 But another [? the other]⁶ companion of Christ, moving rapidly
 in the covered building,

Χριστοῦ δ' ἄλλος ἑταῖρος ὑπωρόφιον γόνυ πάλλων
 ἀνθορεν ἐκ μεγάρου καὶ ἀμφιπόλῳ πυλαωρῷ
 εἶπε καὶ ἦγαγε Πέτρον ἔσω πολυχανδέος αὐλῆς
 χειρὸς ἔχων. καὶ δμῶις ἐπεσβόλος ὄμματι λοξῷ
 δερκομένη πυλαωρὸς ἀνίαχε γείτονι Πέτρῳ
 τοῖον ἔπος· μὴ καὶ σὺ πέλεις Χριστοῖο μαθητής;

¹ "Young." Νέος, in this context, might conceivably mean "newly converted." But if it means "young," Nonnus may allude to the youthfulness traditionally attributed to John the son of Zebedee. "Another companion" is repeated below, with "of Christ," so that we seem obliged to supply "of Christ" here, and cannot well take the words as meaning, "and another young man, [his] companion."

² "Fishing." This apparently refers to the occupation of John the son of Zebedee. But how Nonnus supposed that this could make him a "friend of the High Priest" I cannot even suggest. Perhaps, however, Nonnus is here erroneously applying to John the son of Zebedee literally a tradition that was applied to Judas Iscariot metaphorically. Judas had planned, along with the High Priest, the arrest of Jesus. It might be said, therefore, that Judas and Caiaphas were united in spreading for Jesus (Eccles. ix. 12) "*the evil net*" (comp. Hab. i. 13—15 concerning "the wicked" who "catcheth" men in "his net" since they are "as the fishes of the sea").

³ "A friend" (see below, p. 30) *lit.* "intimately known." The Greek word might also mean "renowned," and Nonnus adds the latter.

⁴ "Accustomed" occurs in Nonnus (Jn xxi. 4) "he asked the seafaring accustomed fishermen (ἐθήμενας ἰχθυοδόλῃας)." Nonnus uses it very frequently, e.g. of "customary" gifts, home, couch, food &c. Perhaps he means that the High Priest was "familiar" to him like his own home.

⁵ "Tardy" presumably implies either fear, or the knowledge that he would be refused admission, so that haste was needless. All he could do was to wait at the door to learn the issue as soon as possible.

⁶ "Another" seems to make no sense, and ἄλλος "the other" would

Leapt-back¹ from the palace, and to the attendant porter²
 Spake, and led Peter inside the spacious courtyard,
 Holding him by the hand³. And a maid, jeering at him, with
 suspicious eye,
 Beholding him, she [I say] that kept the gate called aloud to
 [? her or his] neighbour⁴ Peter
 Such saying [as this]—"Can it be that thou, too⁵, art a disciple
 of Christ?"

make good sense. I can find no instance of the latter in Greek. But comp. Jn xx. 3 (Nonnus) *ωμάρτησε μαθητῆς Ἄλλος ὁμῶς ἐπὶ σῆμα*, where the meaning must be "*the other*." Nonnus does not repeat here, as the Gospel does, "friend" and "High Priest." Here we may note that R.V. is not quite right in rendering identically, by "known unto," both xviii. 15 *γνωστὸς τῷ* (*dative*) and xviii. 16 *ὁ γνωστὸς τοῦ* (*genitive*). The first need not, the second must, imply intimacy.

¹ "Leapt-back," a rarer meaning than "leapt-up," but required by the sense, and allowable (Steph. *Thes.*). It implies emotion or distraction in the Disciple.

² "Porter" (not "*portress*" which the Gospel text has). This is also the reading of SS (see below, p. 27, n. 3). The Disciple speaks to the Porter, and, to make Peter's admission sure, takes him in, as it were, under his wing. If we may suppose an interval, the Porter's maid-servant—though saying nothing at the moment, in the presence of the Porter and the Disciple—flouts Peter afterwards. Chrysostom expressly dissents from this view: "*Why did not the Disciple himself bring Peter in?*" He was keeping-close to Christ and following close on Him. For this cause he bade the woman bring Peter in."

³ "Taking him by the hand" *i.e.* as guarantee of personal knowledge. This is perhaps more probable than the view that Peter hesitated, as though saying: "I can be of no service, inside the Palace, either to my Lord or to the rest. But I would fain wait outside to learn the issue as soon as may be and let the others know of it," and as though the Disciple replied "But come in you must, for I know you wish (as I do) to see as well as to hear."

⁴ "Neighbour." Does this mean that she came close to Peter and sat down near him, so that he was, for the time, her "neighbour"? Or does it mean that Peter was the "neighbour" of the other Disciple at the time of entering?

⁵ "Thou, too," that is, "thou as well as thy companion." Nonnus takes this as a jibe (s. *ἐπεσβόλος*). Chrysostom does not; he explains "thou, too" thus: "Because John was inside"—that is, because Peter had, as his companion, inside the palace, a friend of her Master, the High Priest—and he adds "*So mildly* did she accost him."

In the Gospel narrative there are some variations in the MSS and Versions, and some also in one part of the (apparently) genuine text as compared with another part. They necessitate not only a close examination of this passage speaking of "*another* disciple" but also a comparison of it with the passage that later on speaks of "*the other* disciple¹." The former is said to have been "known to," and "the intimate-friend of," the High Priest. The latter is said to be the one "whom Jesus was wont to love." Some inferior MSS and authorities have altered "*another*," here, into "*the other*," conforming the former to the latter—naturally, but possibly with the result of completely changing the sense. Also the Syro-Sinaitic Version, consistently, in both passages, either omits "*other*" or alters it into "*one*" or "*that*." The similarity between the Hebrew "*one*" (sometimes meaning "*a certain person*") and "*other*" is so great as to cause many errors in the LXX². These facts must be remembered in studying the Johannine text, which runs thus³: "Now there was following Jesus Simon Peter and another⁴ disciple⁵. Now that

¹ Jn xx. 2 foll.

² See *Indices to Diatessarica* p. 22.

³ Jn xviii. 15—17 Ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος μαθητής. ὁ δὲ μαθητής ἐκεῖνος ἦν γνωστός (marg. γνωστός ἦν, τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ συνεισῆλθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αἵλην τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἰστήκει πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ ἔξω. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητής ὁ ἄλλος ὁ γνωστός τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θυρωρῇ καὶ εἰσηγάγει τὸν Πέτρον. λέγει οὖν τῷ Πέτρῳ ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρὸς Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου ;

⁴ Chrys., and some inferior authorities, have "the other." Comp. Jn xxi. 2 "and *others* of [*lit.* from] his disciples *two*." Why does not John name the "two"? Is it because he was ignorant? There are reasons for conjecturing that Andrew and Philip are meant. Nonnus expressly mentions "Andrew" after "Peter," making eight instead of seven. Pseudo-Peter breaks off thus, § 14 "But I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother, having taken our nets went to the sea. And there was with us Levi, the son of Alpheus, whom the Lord...." Chrys. has, freely, καὶ ἦσαν Σίμων ὁμοῦ καὶ Θωμᾶς καὶ Ναθαναὴλ ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου κληθεὶς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ ἄλλοι δύο.

⁵ Blass prints xviii. 15 [ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος] καὶ εἰς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν γνωστός ἦν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ καὶ συνεισῆλθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αἵλην.

disciple was *friend* (lit. *known*) to¹ the high priest and entered in with Jesus into the court of the high priest, but Peter was standing at the door outside. There came out therefore the other disciple that was *the friend* (lit. *the known*) of² the high priest, and spoke to the portress³ and brought in (*or*, she brought in⁴) Peter. There saith therefore to Peter the maid-servant⁵ [that was] the portress, Can it be that thou also art [one] of the disciples of this man?"

¹ Γνωστός τῷ here, but ὁ γνωστός τοῦ in the next verse, so that the text leads us perhaps from a possibility of the meaning "acquaintance," to a certainty of the meaning "intimate friend." The reading γνωστός ἦν τῷ ᾧ. was probably intended to separate γνωστός from ᾧ. and to suggest that it did not mean "friend of," but only "known to."

² See below, p. 30 for the proof that γνωστός in this sentence means "intimate friend."

³ "Portress," but Nonnus and SS "porter" masc.

⁴ "She brought in." So Chrys., but it is less probable than "(he) brought in." Εἰσάγω is used in the parall. Lk. xxii. 54 of bringing Jesus as a prisoner into the palace, and sim. in Acts xxi. 37, xxii. 24, and of the "leading in" of the feeble and helpless, in Lk. ii. 27, xiv. 21, Acts ix. 8. So there is something to be said for Nonnus' rendering "led, taking by the hand." But in a few N.T. instances the word means simply "introduce" (Acts xxi. 28—9, Heb. i. 6). The only other N.T. use of the word is in Acts vii. 45, of "bringing in" the tabernacle.

⁵ "The maidservant." There were discussions about the Attic and the Hellenic meanings of παιδίσκη (see Steph. *Thes.*) but there can be no question about the N.T. use of the word, as always denoting a servant not free. Comp. Gal. iv. 22 foll. "one by the *handmaid* (A.V. *bondmaid*) the other by the freewoman." In Acts xvi. 16, it means a slave possessed with a spirit of divination, who brings her masters "much gain." Also note Lk. xii. 45 τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τὰς παιδίσκας (parall. Mt. xxiv. 49 συνδούλους) where A.V. has "maidens," but R.V. "*maidservants*." So in Acts xii. 13 A.V. "damsel," R.V. "maid," but probably "*maidservant*" employed as portress, not necessarily young (comp. Lk. xxii. 57 "*Woman*, I know him not"). All the Evangelists use παιδίσκη in this passage. But whereas they call her (Mk xiv. 66) μία τῶν παιδισκῶν, (Mt. xxvi. 69) μία παιδίσκη, (Lk. xxii. 56) παιδίσκη τις, John explains that she was "the maidservant that was the portress (ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρός)."

But, if so, why did not John call her thus at once:—"he spake to *the maidservant that was portress*...then saith to Peter *the portress*"? Why write "the portress (τῇ θυρωρῇ)" first, and "the maidservant that was

THE DISCIPLE KNOWN UNTO THE HIGH PRIEST

We pass to the Synoptic narrative, which describes Peter's entrance as being without any intervention :

Mk xiv. 54	Mt. xxvi. 58	Lk. xxii. 54—5
And Peter had followed him afar off, even within, into the court of the high priest, and he was sitting with the officers.	But Peter followed him afar off, unto the court of the high priest, and entered in, and sat with the officers.	But Peter followed afar off. And when they had... Peter sat in the midst of them.

It will be observed that Luke (and Luke alone) describes Peter as being "*in the midst of*"¹ those whom Mark and Matthew describe as "the officers." Also John (and John alone) connects Peter's entrance with a "*portress*." Compare :

2 S. iv. 6 (Heb.)	2 S. iv. 6 (LXX)
And thither <i>they entered even-into the midst of</i> the house.	And behold <i>the portress of</i> the house.

Here LXX has the same word as John (*θυρωρός*), and Gesenius prefers such a reading of the Hebrew text as is implied by the LXX². In Hebrew, "*porter*," or "*gate-*

portress (*ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρός*) "second ? The order is hardly explicable, and it suggests that τῇ θ. is an error for τῇ φ. θ., and that (as Nonnus and SS say) the disciple first "spake to *the porter*," and then there followed the action of "*the maidservant that was portress*," that is to say, a subordinate of the "porter." She overheard what had been said to the "porter" by the disciple of Jesus, and presently came and jested at Peter about it.

An interval may be supposed to have elapsed after the disciple has brought Peter in. The disciple leaves Peter, and departs to the upper chamber. Peter comes into the throng of servants and guards. Then the maidservant comes and asks him whether he, too—like his influential companion the friend of the High Priest—is a disciple of Jesus.

¹ Lk. xxii. 55 μέσος. Lk. has used ἐν μέσῳ in the same verse, "and when they had (*lit.*) kindled-around (*περιαψάντων*) (*Son of Man* 3369 a) a fire *in the midst of* (*ἐν μέσῳ*) the court."

² Gesen. 1045 a. The interchange of "*into the midst*" and "*porter*" would be easier in Aramaic than in Hebrew (*Levy Ch.* ii. 561 b).

keeper," is identical in consonants with "gate." Hence there appears to be a similarity between this confusion of "gate-keeper" and "in the midst" in Samuel, with a confusion of "gate-way" or "porch" with "in the midst" in Isaiah, where the Hebrew "in the midst" is rendered by LXX "in the porch¹." This is all the more to the point because Mark alone, a little later, mentions as the scene of the second denial, "fore-court," and the parallel Matthew alone mentions "porch²," and the confusion between these words and "porter," in the LXX, is very frequent³. Since therefore "in the midst" is confused by the LXX twice with "portress" or "porch," and since "porter" and "porch" are still more frequently confused, the question arises whether this (at first sight) insignificant phrase of Luke, "in the midst," may not be of crucial importance in guiding us through the mazes of the narrative of the Denial as told in the Four Gospels, and also in leading us to some satisfactory explanation of the personality and action of the disciple who, as our Revised Version says, "was known to the high priest."

But here we must stop to ask whether "known" is an adequate rendering. The Greek word, as applied to persons, is extremely rare. It occurs in N.T. only here and in two passages where the parents of Jesus are described as searching for Him among their kindred and "acquaintance," and where "all his acquaintance...stood afar off" round His Cross⁴. The margin of the latter passage refers us to the Psalms, where the same Greek word is repeated, "Thou hast put mine acquaintance far from me," repeated thus, "Lover and friend hast thou put far from me, and mine acquaintance into darkness⁵." But even our Revisers have rightly shrunk from rendering it by "acquaintance," and have retained "familiar-friend," in the

¹ Is. lxvi. 17, LXX ἐν τοῖς προθύροις.

² Mk xiv. 68 προαύλιον (not elsewhere in N.T.), Mt. xxvi. 71 πυλῶν.

³ The same Heb. word means (Tromm. Index p. 127 δ) πυλῶν (6), πυλωρός (3): and in another form πυλωρός (28), θυρωρός (2), πύλη (6).

⁴ Lk. ii. 44, xxiii. 49, γνωστός.

⁵ Ps. lxxxviii. 8, 18.

complaint "It was thou, a man mine equal, my companion, and my *familiar-friend*¹." In Greek literature it is almost non-occurrent in this sense, but in the Greek Bible, when applied to persons and used as a noun, it appears to mean this and nothing else—"intimate-friend," "a person in one's bosom" or "in one's counsels²." Hesychius places it as parallel to "brother³."

If the Greek noun is to have the signification that it has elsewhere in the Greek Bible, it ought here to mean Judas Iscariot, described first, preparatively, as "known to the high priest," and then as the "intimate partaker of the high priest's counsels." Judas had made a covenant with the chief priests to betray Jesus, and had arranged with them a plan by which the arrest might be effected without disturbance. His comings and goings during these negotiations might naturally give him an entry to the High Priest's palace, and lay him open to the Christian reproach that he, who should have been the "familiar friend" of Jesus, had made himself the "familiar friend" of Caiaphas. That was the way in which Christians might apply the words in the Psalm "It was thou...*my familiar friend*." Concerning this utterance Jerome says "It was the saying of Christ about *Judas*"; and Origen assumes it⁴.

¹ Ps. lv. 13. Γνωστός occurs also in 2 K. x. 11 R.V. "*familiar friends*," A.V. txt "*kinsfolks*," marg. "*acquaintance*," Ps. xxxi. 11 "I am become...a fear to mine *acquaintance*." These are the only instances where γνωστός represents "intimately-known [friend]." In Ps. lxxvi. 1 γνωστός...ὁ θεός, and Is. xix. 21 "known to the Egyptians," it means "renowned," "known as a conqueror." In Prov. xxxi. 23 "her husband is *known* in the gates," LXX περίβλεπτος, Sym. has γνωστός. In Nehem. v. 10 "likewise my brethren and my *servants* (Heb. lit. *youths, lads*)" LXX has γνωστοί which makes better sense. The Heb. for "known" and for "youths" might be somewhat similar.

² Used absolutely it might mean "noble" or "renowned." Nonnus has (1) γνωτός, (2) ἀρίδηνλος, (3) ἐθήμονος, as quoted above, p. 23, n. 2; also see Jerome *Epist.* 127 § 5, "John was of *noble birth and known to the high priest*."

³ Steph. *Theas.* also refers to Cyrill. Lex. Ms. : γνωστούς, ἀδελφούς.

⁴ Ps. lv. 13 (Gesen. 394 b) Vulg. "*notus*," on which however Jerome

If Judas brought Peter into the court of the High Priest's palace, that will explain a difficulty in the following:

Mk xiv. 66—7

Mt. xxvi. 69

Lk. xxii. 56

And as Peter was beneath¹ in the court, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest; and seeing Peter warming himself, she looked (*lit.* looking - attentively) upon him and saith, Thou also wast with the Nazarene, [even] Jesus.

Now Peter was sitting without in the court: and a (*lit.* one) maid came unto him saying, Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilaean.

And a certain maid seeing him as he sat in the light [of the fire] and looking stedfastly upon him, said, This man also was with him.

What reason had the maid for bringing this charge? None is given by the Synoptists. Mark and Luke suggest one by the words "looking-attentively" and "looking-stedfastly upon him," as though she had seen him before. But they have not told us when or how she had seen him before.

(*inter alia*) says, in the person of Christ, "Quia me, per legis mysterium, cognoveras esse venturum," as though it meant "*knowing*," and on "*dux*" he says "*dux dicit, propter quod Christum tradidit, dux mortis fuit.*" It is quoted by Origen (Lomm. ii. 440—1) to shew that Judas once loved Jesus (comp. *ib.* iv. 403).

¹ "Beneath," *κάτω*. Comp. 1 K. vi. 8 R.V. txt "*middle*," but R.V. marg. "Sept. and Targ. have *lowest*." Trommius' Index p. 131 gives consecutively (1) a word frequently meaning *κάτω*, *κάτωθεν* &c., (2) a word regularly rendered "*middle*," *μέσος* (7 times) but *περίστυλον*, "*portico*," once, and *ὑποκάτωθεν*, "*below*," once (as in 1 K. vi. 8). *Κάτω* occurs only 9 times in N.T. (setting aside Jn viii. 6—8). Its use by Mark alone here affords an additional proof of a Hebrew original. Probably the Marcan "*below*," like the Lucan "*midst*," originated in a poetic thought. Simon was not only in the *midst* of temptation, but also *sunk* or *sinking* in it, *beneath* the waters of Sheol, comp. Sir. li. 2 foll., where the writer praises God for deliverance "from flames of a fire not blown," "from cunning lips," and from temptations in which, he says, "my soul drew near unto death and my life to Sheol *beneath* (*κάτω*)."
Κάτω, in N.T., is not used metaphorically except in Jn viii. 23, "ye are from *beneath* (*κάτω*)."

On the other hand, if this (R.V.) "*maid*" was really "*the portress*," and if she had often admitted Judas before to the palace while he was arranging his plans with Caiaphas, and if she now admitted Peter along with Judas, and as a companion introduced by Judas, then the "*maid's*" reason is easily explained, even without Mark's and Luke's "*looking-attentively*" and "*looking-stedfastly*."¹ The "*friend*" being a disciple of Jesus, it was natural that the maid should think Peter, too, a disciple, and perhaps, like Judas, a traitor in the High Priest's pay. And she says, either when she lets him in, or, more probably, a little afterwards, "Can it be that thou, also, (like thy companion) art one of this man's disciples?"

Here we must note that all the four Evangelists have the significant "*also*" ("*Thou also*" or "*This man also*") although the Fourth Evangelist alone gives us something to explain its insertion. It means "*thou also like thy companion.*" Without mention of a companion-disciple, "*also*" is not capable of any natural explanation². This favours the Johannine narrative. But it also favours the view that the companion was Judas—whose comings and goings of late had made him familiar to

¹ "*Looking attentively* (*ἐμβλέψασα*)" and "*looking stedfastly*," however, may not be superfluous if they refer to the action of the portress, when seeing Peter *for the second time*. At first, while admitting Peter under the protection of "*the high priest's friend*," she may have simply noted his face, but said nothing. Later on, coming near Peter, she recognises his face by the light of the fire and addresses him.

² That is to say, if the portress had not known of the presence of *another follower of Jesus* in the palace, she would have said to Peter simply "*Thou art one of the man's followers.*" But having just admitted Judas, she naturally says to Peter "*thou, also.*" Origen says, mystically (on Mt. xxvi. 69) "*Forsitan autem et quicumque est in atrio Caiaphae principis sacerdotum, non potest confiteri Dominum Jesum, nisi fuerit egressus ex atrio ejus....*" Most unfortunately, Origen's commentary on "*the disciple that was the friend of the high priest*" is lost. But we may infer from these words that, in Origen's opinion, "*the disciple*"—whoever he may have been—"could not confess Jesus" as long as he was in the palace. Is this easily reconcilable with the view that it was "*the beloved disciple*"?

the "portress"—and not John, whom we can hardly suppose to have been recently cultivating the acquaintance of Caiaphas with special assiduity.

In a previous treatise an explanation has been given of the prominence given by Luke to the phrase "*into the midst*," and of the phrase "*lighting the fire around*." Luke thinks of Peter as one "*in the midst*" of a fiery trial, a "burning" appointed "to try" the soul¹.

Historically, it is possible to combine an original "*into the midst*," or "*in the midst*," with an original in which Judas, not being deemed worthy of any other title, was called "*that one of the disciples who was the high priest's bosom friend*." It is conceivable that Judas, distracted by contending emotions, after first leaving Peter at the door of the palace and going up to watch the trial, rushed back again and brought Peter in—perhaps even, as Nonnus says, taking him by the hand³—and there left him, in the midst of the guards and servants, to take his chance. Meantime, Judas hurried back again into

¹ See *Son of Man* 3369 a—e, quoting 1 Pet. iv. 12—14, and *Acta Petri* § 7, where Peter says he was "driven mad by 'the devil.'" Comp. Nonnus (on Jn xviii. 25) ἀλῶν.

² Comp. the curious phrase in Mk xiv. 10 "Judas Iscariot *the one of the Twelve*." Here ὁ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα seems to mean "the member of the Twelve that was unique in betraying Jesus." There is also perhaps an allusion to Christ's prediction (Mk xiv. 18, Mt. xxvi. 21) "*One of you shall betray me*" (comp. Jn vi. 70 "*One of you is a devil*")—so that it might mean "*the one of the Twelve that was pointed out by the Lord*." The parall. Mt. xxvi. 14 drops "*the*" before "*one*." The parall. Lk. xxii. 3, "Judas, who was called Iscariot, *being of the number of the Twelve*," is perhaps a paraphrase, meaning that he was that single exception who though "*of the number of the Twelve*," was not really to be called thus, but only "Iscariot." Compare the following parallels (1) Mk xiii. 1 "*one of his disciples*," Mt. xxiv. 1 "*his disciples*," Lk. xxi. 5 "*some*"—where "*one*" might denote Judas Iscariot—impressed by the splendour of the Temple; (2) Mk xiv. 4 "*some*," Mt. xxvi. 8 "*the disciples*," Jn xii. 4 "Judas Iscariot, *one of his disciples*, he that was to deliver him up."

³ But see *Indices to Diatessarica* pp. 21—2, shewing that the confusions between "grasp-with-the-hand (אָחַז)," "one (אֶחָד)," "another (אֲחֵר)" &c. are very frequent.

the judgment-chamber to witness the result of the trial—perhaps still not without some faint and sudden hope that, after all, Jesus would be forced to resort to His miraculous powers, or would, at all events, somehow escape death. Matthew places the suicide of Judas as happening “when he saw that Jesus was condemned,” so that his remorse and death (in Matthew) closely follow Peter’s penitence. According to Matthew, therefore, the two Apostles—if Judas was “the high priest’s friend”—were together almost up to the last moment of the life of the betrayer. The motives of Judas in leading Peter into a position of sore temptation may not have been malignant. They may even have been friendly. But, friendly or not, they turned out badly for Peter.

The same thing must be said, so far as concerns the result, if the unnamed disciple was not Judas, but that one of the Twelve whom Jesus specially loved. His action “turned out badly for Peter.” And does that seem an event likely in itself, or likely to be picked out for record by the author of the Fourth Gospel though passed over by the Three? The more we reflect on the consistent conception of the quiet, thoughtful, and retiring character of the beloved disciple in the Fourth Gospel, the more difficult shall we find it to believe that he was an intimate friend of Caiaphas, or that he was made the instrument of plunging Peter into temptation by his impulsive conduct, or that the author of the Fourth Gospel intends us to believe this. Perhaps Origen’s instinct led him right when he said, in his mystical fashion, that it was “impossible for a disciple of Christ to confess Jesus while he was in the palace of Caiaphas¹.” If Origen really meant this—even mystically—would he have accepted our modern view, that, at the very moment when Peter was in that palace, the beloved disciple was also there, and not only there, but there in the character of “the friend of the

¹ See p. 32, n. 2.

high priest" who had been, for days past, plotting his Master's death?

On the other side it may be urged that if Origen had believed the "other disciple" to be Judas, some record of his belief would have been preserved by other early commentators. But why? The belief of Augustine, that the "other disciple" was not John, but some unknown person, does not seem to have been preserved by other early commentators. Jerome's view—that John was "of noble birth and known to the High Priest"—indicates an early and desperate conjecture to explain an obscure passage that may well have received many early explanations not all of which have survived¹. Such as have survived teem with inconsistencies. Chrysostom first says that it was "*a great moral triumph*" that the disciple followed Jesus when the others deserted; but then he adds that the Evangelist said that he was an acquaintance of the High Priest, "so that *no one should wonder at his following, or proclaim his praise for his bravery*²." Ammonius the Elder says "John went in with Jesus, along with the multitude *in the character of one unknown [to the High Priest]*, and then *in the character of one known [to the High Priest]*, spoke to the portress and brought in Peter³." The whole of Jerome's laboured explanation, quoted above, shews that kind of

¹ According to Jerome (*Letters* cxxvii. 5, ed. Wace and Schaff, p. 255) it was because John "had renounced both rank and wealth" that Jesus "loved the evangelist more than the other disciples. For John was of noble birth and known to the high priest, *yet* was so little appalled by the plottings of the Jews that he introduced Peter into his court...." Would not one have supposed that instead of "*yet*"—which I have italicised—Jerome would have written "*and consequently*"? And had not John's elder brother, James, also "renounced both rank and wealth," so that, according to Jerome's view, Jesus should have loved James "more than the other disciples"?

² "*A great moral triumph*," μέγα κατόρθωμα, but Cramer "*a very great wonder*," μέγιστον θαῦμα.

³ Cramer *ad loc.* Συνεισηλθεν ὁ Ἰωάννης τῷ Ἰησοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀγνώστως, καὶ τότε ὡς γνωστός εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῷ, καὶ εἰσήνεγκε τὸν Πέτρον.

incoherence and inconsistency which vacillates between a "nevertheless" and a "therefore."

I have not been able to find any references to this passage in Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. If none can be found, there is little basis for inference as to what Alford calls the "universal opinion," so far as concerns the Ante-Nicene Fathers. But Augustine's dissent from that "universal opinion," when combined with Origen's remark on the impossibility for a disciple of Christ to confess Jesus while he was "in the palace of Caiaphas," appears to me to go some way toward demonstrating that in the first three centuries the modern view was by no means "universal," and that Origen, as well as Augustine, dissented from it.

In concluding these remarks on the Johannine account of Peter's Denial it may be well to add that, although the evidence rather favours John against the Synoptists, it must not be inferred that this favourable judgment extends to all the details and still less to the context. As regards the Johannine "*portress*," we are able to point out, not only that her introduction illuminates the whole of the Synoptic narrative, but also that there are verbal grounds for preferring it to the parallel Lucan insistence on the trial of Peter "*in the midst*" of his enemies. For we have seen that, in Samuel, modern scholars prefer the LXX "*portress*" to the actual reading of the Hebrew text "*in the midst*." Yet in the preceding Johannine context there occurs a detail to which attention will be called in due course, where John seems to have mistaken the "going backward" and "falling away" of the *disciples*, at the moment of Christ's arrest, for the "going backward" and "falling to the ground" of *the Roman cohort*.

In view of the palpable sources of the misunderstanding

noted below¹, comment on this "going backward" is needless. John appears to have made a great mistake. But it is nothing more than a mistake. It is a misinterpretation of two or three words, every one of which can be shewn to have been ambiguous. There is no solid ground for basing on his error the charge of indifference to fact. But there is ground, here as elsewhere, for concluding that no tradition, of any Evangelist, should be accepted on the authority of that Evangelist alone, without examining its relation to Evangelistic traditions as a whole. These, as being Greek writings or translations, must of course be criticized as Greek. But this is only a secondary aspect. Primarily they are to be interpreted as the product of Hebrew and Jewish thought, and in the light of that "scripture" to which Jesus constantly refers.

¹ Mk xiv. 50	Mt. xxvi. 56	Lk. xxii. 53—4	Jn xviii. 6
And <i>they</i> (i.e. the disciples) all left him and fled.	Then <i>the disciples</i> all left him and fled.	Omits.	<i>They</i> (i.e. the soldiers) went away backward and fell to the ground.

(1) Mark's words seem clear enough to us. But Matthew, by adding "disciples," faintly suggests that, in his opinion, some might take the original of Mark's ἀφέντες αὐτόν as "[the soldiers] letting go their prisoner." Luke, by omitting the whole, confirms the view that there was some obscurity.

(2) "Left him," ἀφέντες αὐτόν, is ambiguous, since it might mean "[the soldiers] letting him go [for the time]," comp. 2 Chr. xxviii. 14, 1 Macc. xiii. 16, 19.

(3) "Went backward," ἀπῆλθαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, is ambiguous, since it might mean that Christ's disciples went backward in the sense of falling away, or deserting Him. It is actually so used in Jn vi. 66 ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω. Delitzsch has in both places the same Heb. (for ὀπίσω) and it is connected (Gesen. 30 ὅ) with (1) revolt as well as (2) repulse.

(4) "Fell," ἔπεσαν, is ambiguous, since the Hebrew regularly rendered πίπτω may mean "fall away," "desert," as in 1 S. xxix. 3, Jer. xxxix. 9. No doubt Mark's "*fled*," ἔφυγον, is clear enough. But see Jer. xxxvii. 13 "fall-away," *lit.* "fall," LXX here, and later on, φεύγω, Aq. πίπτω, Sym. αὐτομολέω.

(5) "To the ground," χαμαί, is added by John to πίπτω as it is by

the LXX in Dan. ii. 46. The LXX adds it merely for emphasis. Here, in an obscure tradition, John had also motives of clearness.

John, as has been said above, appears to have made a great mistake. But we shall make a still greater mistake if we suppose that so great a writer has erred through mere love of such hyperbole as originated the fanciful legend in the *Acta Pilati* of the Roman standards bowing before Jesus. John *did his best to interpret what Luke had omitted and what some early traditions had probably obscured and variously reported*. Biassed by idealism, he nevertheless did not invent, but interpreted a Hebrew original in a new way. Historically he was not justified. But he was justified by grammar as well as by conscience. And that is the great point—to shew that this extraordinary and most spiritual Evangelist did not soar above earthly considerations of fact so far as he could ascertain it.

CHAPTER III

THE INTERPRETATION OF EARLY CHRISTIAN POETRY

IN previous volumes of *Diatessarica* it has been shewn that Hebrew poetic expressions, passing into Greek prose and interpreted prosaically, might give rise to serious misunderstandings. Recently the discovery of the Syriac poems commonly known as Odes of Solomon, but perhaps better called Songs of Solomon, has brought before Biblical students two questions. The first is, "Are we to interpret these particular poems as originally written in Syriac, or as coming to us from a Syriac version of Hebrew, or from a Syriac version of Greek?" The second is of a general character, "Will the different hypotheses of origin, in this and other similar discoveries, make any great difference in the interpretation?"

In the Ninth Part of *Diatessarica*, a volume entitled *Light on the Gospel from an Ancient Poet*, I gave reasons for thinking that the Odes came to us from Hebrew. A contrary view has been recently set forth by Dom Connolly with great ability, and fortified by definite quotations of Syriac expressions that appeared to him to correspond exactly to expressions in original Greek¹. Although I am unable to agree with its conclusions, I am heartily grateful to Dom Connolly who, in response to an appeal of mine for

¹ *The Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1913, pp. 530—8. *Greek the Original Language of the Odes of Solomon*. By the Rev. R. H. Connolly, O.S.B.

facts, has adduced eight passages, besides repeating one previously adduced, that seem to him to present "cogent reasons for concluding not merely that the Syriac is a translation from Greek, but also that the Odes were composed in Greek." It appears to me that the discussion of these passages may be used to throw light on many obscurities that await us in the interpretation of passages in the Gospels, when we doubtfully ask ourselves, "Is this or that to be interpreted, as Greek thought, logically and literally, or as Jewish thought, poetically and metaphorically?"

If my readers learn from Dom Connolly as much as I have learned, they will be grateful to me for presenting his arguments to them, even though they find no cause for gratitude in what I have said on the other side. I proceed to take his eight new quotations in the order in which he places them, reserving to the last (§ 9) the one previously adduced.

§ 1. "*Without envy*"

The argument from this phrase, for a Greek original, is stated by Dom Connolly thus:—"In Ode vii. 4 we read: 'He caused me to know Himself without envy in (*or*, by) His simplicity....' Dr Harris notes that the Syriac expression 'without envy' stands for ἀφθόρως; and to me it appears that it evidently does so."

Later on¹ Dom Connolly quotes Dr Harris as saying "An interesting example" of the Syriac phrase as a rendering of ἀφθόρως "will be found in Ode II v. 6, where we read 'speaking waters touched my lips from the fountain of God without grudging' (*i.e.* abundantly²)."

¹ *Journ. Theol. Stud.* p. 536.

² Dom Connolly is quoting from Dr Harris' introduction to the second edition, p. 47. In his textual rendering (second ed. p. 105) Dr Harris has "plenteously." "Fountain of God" should be "fountain of the Lord," see p. 65, n. 1.

Harris gets rid of the negation "without," and of the moral thought of "grudging," by paraphrasing the two words as one, "abundantly." Dom Connolly adopts this positive paraphrase by adding, in words that I italicise, "*Here the context requires the really positive idea which ἀφθόνης expresses, but which the Syriac does not express.*" Now I admit that ἀφθόνης—unless used in special contexts which we shall consider later on—would naturally mean "abundantly" and nothing more. Thucydides and Polybius use it of darts showered "abundantly" on the enemy, and Athenaeus of cakes "abundantly" soaked in honey¹. That being the case, if I believed that the Poet himself wrote in Greek using ἀφθόνης in its ordinary Greek sense, I should say that "abundantly" (with a footnote attached) was the best translation, and that "without grudging," though a literal rendering of the Syriac, misled the English reader.

But if the Poet wrote in Hebrew then the aspect of the phrase is completely changed. For then we shall have to ask whether this is not one of many instances of Hebrew negative thought about the gifts of God. They are given "*with-not* (i.e. *without*) money and *with-not* (i.e. *without*) price"; they are "*without* repentance"; they are given by One who "upbraideth *not*"². Ben Sira also says "Buy her [*i.e.* the truth] for yourselves *without* money"³. It is as a climax of this Hebrew negative contrast that Jesus says "*Not* as the world giveth give I unto you"⁴. Philo writes in Greek but thinks in Hebrew when he says "God is *not* a tradesman selling his goods at a profit but a Being that would fain give all things, pouring-up (*sic*) the everflowing streams of graces, *not* craving an exchange"⁵.

When Paul bids the Corinthians give "*not grudgingly* or of necessity," he is but carrying on the Hebrew doctrine that

¹ See Steph. *Thes.* i (2) 2651.

² Is. lv. 1, Rom. xi. 29 ἀμεταμέλητα, Jas. i. 5.

³ Sir. li. 25 *lit.* "with-not money."

⁴ Jn xiv. 27.

⁵ Philo i. 161 "pouring up" = ἀναχέων.

God said to the Israelite "Beware that there be *not a base thought in thine heart...and thine eye be evil* against thy poor brother....Thou shalt surely give him, and thine heart *shall not be grieved* (lit. *shall not be made evil*) when thou givest him¹." And all Christians know how Jesus emphasized this ancient Hebrew warning that the "eye" of the true Israelite must *not be "evil"*².

We shall shew, later on, that Philo and the earliest of the Christian Fathers connect the thought of "*grudging*" or "*envy*" with the thought of the Tree of Life in Paradise, protesting that God *did not "grudge" His best gifts to Man*. Passing over that for the present, we may here note that "*pouring-up streams*" refers to the "stream" that "*went up*" in Paradise (according to LXX and Philo) to water the earth³. This (said Philo) was the Mind, the Controlling Power in man, the source through which God dispenses to him His gifts and graces.

Now a reference to the other uses of "without *envy*"—which I will venture to render "without *grudging*"⁴—throughout the Odes, suggests that it is used in connection with a Tree of Life or a Fountain of Life which the Poet regards as being in the midst of Paradise. This Tree of Life is also the Tree of Knowledge, the Knowledge of God Himself. As regards the Tree of the Knowledge of good and evil, God might be said by sceptics like Celsus to have broken His own rule against "muzzling" the ox that "treadeth out the corn"⁵,

¹ 2 Cor. ix. 7 *μὴ ἐκ λύπης*, Deut. xv. 10 (LXX) *οὐ λυπηθήσῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου*.

² Mk vii. 22, Mt. vi. 23, Lk. xi. 34.

³ Philo i. 249, 573, quoting Gen. ii. 6 R.V. "mist," but LXX and Philo *πηγή*, Aq. *ἐπιβλυσμός*.

⁴ A different Syriac word is used in Ode vii. 23 "And hatred shall be thrown from the earth, and together-with *envy* shall it be drowned (*or, sunk*)."

⁵ Deut. xxv. 4. The Heb. verb for "muzzle" which occurs only there (see Gesen. 340 *b*, which rejects Ezek. xxxix. 11) is identical with the Syr.

and to have "muzzled" Man. For He placed it in the midst of Eden and yet forbade him to eat of it. But as regards the Tree of that higher Knowledge which is Life and which is also God's Love, there is, for the disciples of the Messiah, "*no muzzling*," or "*no grudging*." "Walk ye," says the Poet, "in the knowledge of the Most High *that is without grudging*." This—the last instance of the phrase—is to be explained by the preceding one, "Put on [thyself] the good-grace of the Lord *that is without grudging*, and come into Paradise, and make thee a crown from His tree, and put it on thy head¹." This is typical of Abraham (who abandoned the worship of idols and of the stars and was "justified by grace"); and so, too, is a preceding instance "I have left the way of error and have come to Him and have received from Him redemption *that is without grudging*²." The same thought is expressed thus under the metaphor of a fountain, probably regarded as being in the midst of Paradise, "And speaking water touched my lips from the fountain of the Lord *that is [poured forth] without grudging*³." Passing from these instances to the earliest one of all, we find in them grounds for believing that in this, too, the metaphor is somewhat, though not quite, similar. The Poet seems to begin his poems with a conception of a Tree of Life or Love which is the Lord Himself and in which human souls, the "members" of the Tree, "hang" as branches. Ode i and Ode iii say "The Lord is on my head like a crown, nor shall I be apart from Him...Thou livest upon my head, and thou hast blossomed upon my head. Thy fruits are full and perfect, full of thy salvation...."⁴ I put on. And His

"envy" or "grudge." The noun-form occurs in Ps. xxxix. 1 R.V. "a bridle," or, "a muzzle."¹ Odes xxiii. 4, xx. 7.

² Ode xv. 6, comp. xvii. 12 "I gave my knowledge that is without grudging," *i.e.* the knowledge of God, as Life and Love.

³ Ode xi. 6. Comp. Rev. xxii. 1—2 "And he shewed me a river of water of life...*in the midst of the street thereof*."

⁴ Here Ode i ends, probably incomplete. Ode ii and the first words of Ode iii are missing. But we may infer from Ode xx. 7, quoted above,

members are with Him and in them do I hang...And I shall not be a stranger¹ because there is *no grudging* with the Lord...."

Dom Connolly then passes to consider the phrase "*in His simplicity*," which follows "*without grudging*." "Why," he asks, "is the expression used? If we translate it literally into Greek we seem clearly to have the answer: (ἐν) τῇ ἀπλότητι αὐτοῦ is 'in His bounty' (2 Cor. viii. 2, ix. 11, 13; and ἀπλῶς Jas. i. 5), and this is precisely what the context requires." Similarly he would render the same Syriac word by "generous" in Ode xxxiv. 1 where Dr Harris has "No way is hard where there is a *simple* heart."

But even if we accept the hypothesis of an original Greek ἀπλότης, we must not forget that it always implies "singleness" as opposed to doubleness or duplicity. Dom Connolly refers to 2 Cor. viii. 2 for the meaning of "bounty," but the context shews that τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτῶν must be explained from *ib.* 5 "*they gave themselves first to the Lord, and to us through the will of God.*" Origen explains Rom. xii. 8 ὁ μεταδιδούς ἐν ἀπλοτητι by saying (*ad loc.*) that a man must not seem to be benefiting the needy while in his heart he is seeking praise from men—must not "*seem to be doing one thing* with his hands, while he is *really doing another thing* in his heart." That is to say, he must not be guilty of duplicity. He must be singlehearted. And so elsewhere. In N.T., ἀπλότης never means "bounty" or "liberality," in the popular sense of either word—apart from "singleheartedness."

that the object of "put on" is, or corresponds to, a branch, or garland, from the Tree. There is room, however, for more than one view. It may be (as in the Pauline Epistles) "putting on" Christ, the New Man &c., or it may be "putting on" the grace of Christ. And the "branches" may be the fruits, gifts, or graces of Christ. See *Light on the Gospel* 3670 foll.

¹ Comp. Eph. ii. 19 "no more strangers," where, as here, there is the thought of "one body" on "the cross." But the Epistle passes on to liken the body to a building; the Poem likens it to a tree.

I have given reasons elsewhere¹ for preferring to render the Syriac (a form of *psht*) by some form of "*single*," meaning "*singleness*" in the sense of "*singlehearted kindness to man or love to God*," without that latent streak of self-interestedness which often makes a man "doubleminded." In this sense, the Syriac *psht* occurs in Christ's phrase about the "*single eye*"², where Delitzsch has a form of the Hebrew *tôm* (literally *completeness, soundness*). The adjective *tâm*, applied to Jacob in Genesis, is rendered by Aquila ἀπλοῦς³. The longer form of the root *tôm* used by Delitzsch—identical, when unpointed, with what is called in R.V. *Thummim*—is used in God's precept to Abraham, "Be thou *perfect*," and is rendered by Aquila τέλειος⁴. Onkelos renders *tôm* and *tâmim* by a form of *shalem*. This, both in Hebrew and Aramaic, often implies "soundness"—in the sense of freedom from such blemish or unsoundness as makes a thing not really what it professes to be. In the precept, "Be ye therefore *perfect*"⁵, Delitzsch has a form of *shalem*⁶. In the two instances in which ἀπλότης represents a Hebrew word in O.T. it does not mean liberality, but "*singlemindedness*"⁷.

¹ See *Light on the Gospel* 3760 d.

² Mt. vi. 22.

³ Gen. xxv. 27.

⁴ Gen. xvii. 1, LXX ἄμειπτος.

⁵ Mt. v. 48, see *Son of Man* 3482 a.

⁶ So ed. 1878. I am informed that in ed. 1877 Delitzsch has *tâmim*.

⁷ In 2 S. xv. 11, it means that the followers of Absalom were honestly deceived, and had no dishonest purpose. In 1 Chr. xxix. 17, the LXX means "*in singleness of heart [and without desire to bribe the Lord or receive reward] I willingly-gave all these things....*" The Heb. has "*uprightness of heart*." The first part of the verse says "Thou triest the heart and hast pleasure in *uprightness*." Not the "abundance" of the offering but the "singlemindedness" is emphasized. Comp. the use of "*perfect*" (a form of *shalem*) in *ib.* 9 "with a *perfect* heart they offered-willingly to the Lord, where Rashi says "*With one heart* they gave, with a well-wishing mind, *not with two hearts* ; for there is a giver that gives unwillingly (not a well-wisher) or because he is ashamed of others. And such a man is called by the name of '*two-hearted*.'"

In support of his view Dom Connolly alleges Jas. i. 5. This is rendered by R.V. "Let him ask of God, who giveth to all *liberally* (ἀπλῶς) and upbraideth not." Delitzsch renders ἀπλῶς by a form of the Hebrew word (*nádab*, "incite" or "impel") used by David in Chronicles, as above quoted, when he says, about his preparations for the Temple, "I *willingly-gave* (lit. *followed my own impulse in giving*) all these things¹." The Hebrew *nádab* is applied to those who "volunteer." *Nádáb* is a name for a "prince," because the profession of a prince is to be a "volunteer" and take the lead for the service of his subjects. Accordingly Delitzsch has "He giveth to all *with willingness and with [there-is] no rebuking*." The Hebrew used here by Delitzsch, for "*rebuking*," occurs—among several instances of rebuking encroachments of various kinds—in Ruth, where Boaz says to his reapers "Pull out some [wheat] for her from the bundles, and leave it, and let her glean, and *rebuke* her not²." The picture of Ruth, the stranger, amid the reapers of her future husband, treated as a friend or native, and allowed to do something more than ordinary "gleaning," and this *without "rebuking,"* may illustrate the thought of a passage in the Odes where "*no grudging*" occurs for the first time: "Dearly-love I the Beloved, and [indeed] my soul loveth Him. And where His rest [is], there also am I. And I *shall not be a stranger*, because there is *no grudging* with the Lord [Most] High and [Most] Compassionate³."

In concluding these remarks on the phrases "no grudging" and "singleheartedness," I by no means go so far as to assert that the considerations urged above prove that the poet wrote in Hebrew; but I do venture to assert that they effectually meet the arguments alleged from these phrases to shew that he wrote in Greek. And I think many will feel that the

¹ 1 Chr. xxix. 17, quoted above.

² Ruth ii. 16, comp. Gesen. 172 a.

³ Ode iii. 5—7.

hypothesis of a Hebrew original, or at all events of what may be called an undercurrent of Hebrew allusion, helps us to do justice to the Odes as poetry. It is a poor thing to say that God gives "abundantly," as compared with the saying that He gives like a Father who "grudges nothing" that is for the good of His children, in spite of their frequent ingratitude. And to speak of God as "liberal," or as giving "liberally," is less beautiful (as well as less Hebraic) than to speak of His "heart" as being "single" in its love for man¹.

We shall return to this subject later on, when we deal with "Alleged translation from Greek words with privative alpha," shewing that Philo certainly, and the Book of Wisdom probably, connected God's giving of the highest knowledge with the thought of "freedom from grudging," in a very definite sense, meaning a great deal more than that He gave "abundantly."

§ 2. *"Thou shalt not acquire an alien the blood
of thy soul"*

[Codex N inserts "*by*" before the noun interpreted "blood" (or, by some, "price"). But, as Dom Connolly does not adopt that reading, I pass it by. I have ascertained, however, that the facsimile of Dr Harris' MS agrees with Codex N in inserting "*by*." Dom Connolly was under the erroneous impression that they agree in rejecting "*by*," and four of his arguments—those specified below as from *a* to *d*—are based on that error.

After this Chapter was in type, I heard from Dom Connolly, to whom I had written on the subject, that his mistake was caused, in part, by a somewhat obscure footnote in Dr Harris' second edition. But still, as his allegations

¹ See *Light on the Gospel* 3718 foll. on "God's 'heart' and Man's 'faith,'" and 3999 *b—d* where it is contended that "The 'way' of 'the simple heart'" lays an "emphasis on singleness of heart" which "illustrates other passages in the Odes mentioning the 'heart' of God."

² Ode xx. 5 as quoted by Dom Connolly.

under the four headings are of general interest as bearing on the relation between Greek and Hebrew thought, I have not cancelled my observations on them.]

It is alleged by Dom Connolly that (*a*) "the blood of thy soul" is merely the Syriac way of saying "thine own blood"; that (*b*) "acquire...soul" is a Syriac "translation of the Greek οὐχ ἔξεις (or the like) ἀλλότριον τοῦ ἰδίου αἵμα"; that (*c*) the Greek ἔξεις meant "regard"; that (*d*) the Greek αἷμα meant "flesh and blood"—so that the meaning was "thou shalt not regard as an alien thine own (flesh and) blood"; that (*e*) the passage, with its context, alludes to one in Isaiah "When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh" (R.V.), where "for the second clause the LXX has καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐχ ὑπερόψῃ"; that (*f*) a later verse in the Ode alludes to the same passage in Isaiah; that (*g*) the Ode and the LXX of Isaiah both mention "fatness," where the Hebrew of Isaiah and the Syriac of Isaiah have a different word. The conclusion is, "If then the Odist is dependent on Isaiah here, he must have used the LXX: in other words, this Ode was composed in Greek."

These arguments deserve careful and separate examination. If they were sound, they would seem to me to establish the conclusion that "the Ode was composed in Greek." But most or all of them appear to me to be unsound.

(*a*) "Thy blood" occurs, in Hebrew, thrice, in the phrase "thy blood be upon thy head," and "the dogs shall lick thy blood," and several times (in different contexts) in Ezekiel. In not a single one of these instances is it rendered in Walton's Syriac by "the blood of thy soul¹." It is therefore,

¹ 2 S. i. 16, 1 K. ii. 37, xxi. 19, Ezek. xvi. 22, xix. 10 &c. See Mandelkern p. 298. According to my view, the Syriac of the Odes is a very early and pre-literary rendering of Hebrew, so that the Syriac of O.T. is peculiarly well adapted to illustrate the Syriac of the Odes.

to say the least, unsafe to say that the Syriac phrase here is "merely the Syriac way of saying 'thine own blood'."

(b) The Syriac "acquire" is said to be a translation of the Greek ἔχεις which meant "have" in the sense of "regard" but was wrongly taken to mean "have" in the sense of "acquire." But the Syriac Thesaurus, though it gives multitudes of instances of "acquire" as a rendering of ἔχω, gives none, as far as I can find, where the Greek means "regard."

(c) In the few instances in N.T. where ἔχω means "regard," the Syriac does not use the word "acquire¹." Moreover a later Ode, using a different word for "regard," has "I was *regarded by them as a stranger*," as though to shew that, if the meaning had been "*regard as a stranger*," the translator knew other words to express it².

(d) The Greek αἷμα may be used in various *adverbial phrases* to denote blood-relationship, but the use of *the noun to signify a blood-relation* would seem to be rare and highly poetical. Indeed we should have to pronounce it non-existent, if we trusted in Stephen's Thesaurus. It quotes no Greek instance at all, but only Virgil's "proijce tela manu, *sanguis meus*³."

¹ See Mk xi. 32 and parallels, also Lk. xiv. 18, Philipp. ii. 29, Philem. 17. The sentence "[Thou] that possessest things impossible [as] possible" quoted by Dom Connolly from the Syriac 'Anaphora of St James' seems to me—having regard to the Hebrew use of "possess" or "purchase" in a sense approaching to "create," "bring into being"—intelligible as it stands, "Thou that dost call into being things [that men would have called] impossible." No doubt "create" would be a more usual and obvious word than "purchase"; but "purchase" has associations (Gesen. 889a) with God's victorious redemption that would make the word appropriate here.

² Ode xvii. 6. The word there used for "stranger" is a form of ξένος, different from the word in the passage under consideration.

³ The *Thesaurus* wrongly says "Sed tamen et pater filium vocat sanguinem suum, ut Od. ii. 300 εἰ ἐτερόν γ' ἐμός ἐστι καὶ αἷματος ἡμέτεροιο." It adds, however, the correct translation "*e meo sanguine*," and then quotes Virgil *Aeneid* vi. 836, and vernacular Italian, "*Sangue mio*."

It is asked, "Does not this phrase in itself involve a Grecism? Is there any Hebrew authority for the use of 'blood,' like 'flesh,' in the sense of kith and kin?" To both these questions the answer is negative. First, it does not involve a Grecism; secondly, there is no Hebrew authority for the use of blood to mean kith and kin. But the conclusion should be "*Therefore we must render 'the blood of thy soul' here as having nothing to do with 'kith and kin'.*" It might allude to some phrase where the shedding of blood is implied—such as that in Genesis, where both the Hebrew and the Syriac insert "souls," "Your blood, [*the blood belonging, or, according*] *to your souls*, will I require¹."

(e) "A general parallelism" is said to be indicated between Isaiah lviii and Ode xx. "The unacceptable fast" and the conditions for an "acceptable fast," in the Prophecy, are placed as parallel to "the acceptable sacrifice" and the conditions for it in the Ode. Then it is said that "there is a good deal more than this general parallelism," and the texts are put side by side to shew it:—

Isaiah lviii. 7

"When thou seest the naked,
that thou cover him; and that
thou hide not thyself from thine
own flesh" (R.V.).

Ode xx. 5, 6

5 "Thou shalt not regard as
an alien thine own blood, neither
shalt thou seek to devour thy
neighbour, 6 neither shalt thou
deprive him of the covering of
his nakedness."

Then it is inferred, first, that the Odist is borrowing from Isaiah, and subsequently (from the context in the Ode and the context in Isaiah) that he is borrowing from the rendering of Isaiah as given by the LXX which differs from the Hebrew.

Now of course a very important part of this "general parallelism" and of these apparent coincidences—namely, that between "*thine own flesh*" and "*thine own blood*"—altogether

¹ Gen. ix. 5. The Syr. omits "to" and has "your blood that [is] of your souls."

disappears when we adopt the correct reading in the Ode as above described, "*acquire with the blood of thy soul.*" Nevertheless it appears to me that Dom Connolly would have been safe in inferring that the Poet had Isaiah in view. But I do not think he is right in making Isaiah alone responsible for what he calls "a momentary outburst of realism, in vv. 5 and 6, which is quite unlike the Odist's usual manner."

Because the Poet had Isaiah in view, does it follow that he had Isaiah alone in view? There is a passage in Exodus which Isaiah himself may well have had in view. It forbids the Israelite to deprive his neighbour of his garment at night, "for it is his only *covering*¹." And the context in that passage implies a prohibition to "devour" one's "neighbour" by usury². I should add therefore that the Poet is probably looking back to both passages, to the Law as well as to the Prophet. The Law, in two respects, agrees more closely than the Prophet with the text of the Ode. For the Law, like the Ode, mentions sacrifice; and the Law, like the Ode, is negative, not positive. It begins by prohibiting sacrifice to strange gods³, and goes on to prohibit the affliction of strangers, widows, and the poor. Isaiah makes no mention of sacrifice. But the first four verses of the Ode ("I am a priest of the Lord...nor thy soul do violence to soul") imply that it is on righteous sacrifice that the Poet bases his prohibitions of unrighteousness.

(f) It is suggested that the words of the Ode "and glory [cod. N. His glory] shall go before thee⁴" allude to words in the Prophecy "and *thy righteousness* shall go before thee." But the thought is different. Whatever reading we may

¹ Exod. xxii. 26—7 "If thou at all take thy neighbour's garment to pledge, thou shalt restore it...for that is his only *covering*," where the Syr. for "*covering*" is the same as in the Ode.

² Comp. Exod. xxii. 22 "ye shall not afflict any widow," and Mk xii. 40 &c. "devour widows' houses."

³ Exod. xxii. 20 "He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the Lord only, shall be utterly destroyed."

⁴ Ode xx. 8.

adopt, the "glory" is presumably God's. And "God's glory" is not man's "righteousness." The Poet seems to me to have in view many passages where the Lord, or the glory of the Lord, sometimes manifested in a pillar of fire or cloud, is regarded as going before His people, *e.g.* "The Lord hath made bare His holy arm...*the Lord will go before you,*" and "*the glory of the Lord shall be revealed*!"

(*g*) A further allusion to the LXX of Is. lviii is alleged in the Ode's context, "come into His Paradise...and thou shalt *be fat* in [the?] truth in the praise of His name," corresponding to Is. lviii. 11 LXX "and thy bones *shall be made fat* (πιανθήσεται) and shall be as a garden well-watered (μεθύων)" where the Hebrew has "and the Lord *shall make-strong* thy bones." From this agreement with the LXX it is argued, and with great apparent cogency, "If then the Odist is dependent on Isaiah here, he must have used the LXX: in other words, this Ode was composed in Greek."

But it should have been added that Walton's *literal rendering of the Hebrew in Isaiah* is "impinguabit," "*will-fatten*." And this is the first of three interpretations of the word mentioned in Ibn Ezra's commentary on the passage. Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus give three distinct renderings. The LXX "*fatten*" is a fourth. The R.V. "make strong" is a fifth. Why should not the Odist—even supposing that he was alluding to this passage in Isaiah alone, and to no other similar passage in Scripture—have adopted that interpretation of the Hebrew which is placed first by Ibn Ezra and (I am informed) by Kimchi? Surely, in the face of these facts, it is unsafe to say "he must have used the LXX."

¹ Is. lii. 10—12 and xl. 5. I should be disposed to add Is. lviii. 8 "the glory of the Lord shall be thy rearward."

² Ode xx. 7 "His Paradise": so Dr Harris' English text, but his Syriac, and Harnack's German, have "Paradise." Also "His *name*" is an error for "His *holiness*."

I do not, however, believe that the Odist is alluding to Isaiah alone. If that had been the case, I think he would have given Isaiah's phrase in full, "he shall *make fat thy bones*" or "*thy bones shall be made fat*"—expressions found in Proverbs and Ben Sira¹—instead of "*thou shalt be fat*." Moreover, what is the meaning of "*fat...in the praise of His holiness*"? It seems to need some explanation not to be gleaned from the context of Isaiah.

Now there are only two places in Scripture where the adjective "fat" is applied to man—one, in a neutral sense, "the fat ones of the earth," but the other in a good sense applied to the righteous man who is as it were "*fat*," and *flourishing, to the glory of God*: "They shall still bring forth fruit in old age; *fat and green shall they be, to proclaim that Jehovah is righteous*²." The latter is applied by several Jewish traditions to Abraham. His "*fatness*" was to the glory of God, and his connection with Paradise is recognised in Luke's Parable of Dives and Lazarus, as well as in Jewish literature in general and the Odes in particular³. The Psalmist, then, and not the LXX of Isaiah, may very well have been in the Poet's mind when he says to the soul, typified by Abraham, "Thou shalt receive of His kindness and of His grace⁴, and *thou shalt be fat* in [the?] truth in the praise of His holiness." In any case the language does not necessitate, or even indicate, a Greek original⁵.

¹ Prov. xv. 30 (xvi. 2), Sir. xxvi. 13.

² Gesen. 206 *b*, referring to Ps. xxii. 29, xcii. 14—15.

³ See *Light on the Gospel* 3873 *c*, 3875 *e*. Comp. Ps. xxxvi. 8 "They shall be abundantly satisfied with the *fatness* of thy house; and thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures"—apparently alluding to Paradise as well as to the Temple (*Light* 3853—5).

⁴ See *Light on the Gospel* 3822. It is in connection with Abraham that God's "kindness and truth" are first mentioned, and his name is also closely connected with "grace."

⁵ Space does not admit of an attempt to shew how the words rendered above "thou shalt not acquire an alien the blood of thy soul" might be

§ 3. "*And those that were silent became with speech*"

This is Dom Connolly's rendering of a sentence (in Ode xii) rendered by Dr Harris: "And in the word [*mellēthā* here] were those that were silent." The Ode treats of the Word. A previous verse called it *pethgāmā*, saying "the swiftness of *the Word* (*pethgāmā*) is indescribable." The present verse says "And by it [i.e. *the pethgāmā*] the worlds spoke one to another, and"—according to Dom Connolly's rendering—"those that were silent *became with*² *speech* (*mellēthā*)." The words that I have italicised he explains as meaning "acquired the power of speech, became vocal," adding "I am now confident that this is the true meaning,

interpreted on the hypothesis of a Hebrew original. I believe, but cannot at present prove, that the text is corrupt, and that, if it could be restored, it would imply a prohibition of the worship of "a strange god" (*lit.* "provoking with a stranger").

The following facts seem to me to point in that direction. (1) The word used here for "*stranger*" is found (*Thes.* 2380) masc. in Deut. xxxii. 16, meaning "*strange* [*gods*]," and fem. in Lev. xx. 2—5, meaning "*Molech*." (2) In Deut. xxxii. 16 "they *provoked* him with strange [*gods*]," the Heb. for "*provoke*," or "*make-jealous*," is the causative of קנא. This is confused with "*acquire*" קנה in Ezek. viii. 3 by Theod. "the image of the jealousy of *the acquirer*" (Heb. "the image of jealousy *which-maketh-jealous*"), and in Prov. iii. 31 by LXX "*acquire not*" (Heb. "*envy not*"). (3) Conversely, in Is. xi. 11 Heb. "*acquire* (i.e. redeem)" is rendered by LXX ζηλοῦν "*be jealous for*." (4) Levy *Ch.* ii. 372 *a* gives קנא (as well as קני) as meaning "*acquire*" &c.; and in Deut. xxxii. 6 "He that possessed thee," where Onk. paraphrases with "thou art *His* (רילוה)," Jer. I and Jer. II have forms of קנא. (5) The causative of Heb. קנא occurs (Gesen. 888 *b*) only in four passages (Deut. xxxii. 16, 21, Ps. lxxviii. 58 and Ezek. viii. 3), and is, in each of the four, associated with the thought of "strange [*gods*]," "no-god," "idols" &c. (6) A prohibition of idolatry would accord with the parallelism noted above between the Ode and Exod. xxii. 20 foll., which prohibits sacrifice to "any god save unto the Lord only."

¹ Ode xii. 8.

² Dom Connolly adds, in a note, "The Syriac preposition 'in' may also be translated 'by' or 'with,' as the context requires."

and I believe that the Syriac of *v.* 8^b is merely an attempt at translating literally *καὶ τὰ ἄφωνα ἔμφωνα ἐγένετο.*"

We must carefully distinguish this conclusion from one that would accept the rendering "those that were silent *became in discourse, or converse,*" i.e. discoursed or conversed together—taking *mellēthā* to mean Logos, in a somewhat different sense (it is true) from *pethgāmā*, but still Logos. Dom Connolly (*a*) pins himself to *φωνή* as the ground for (*b*) an assonance between *ἔμφωνα* and *ἄφωνα*. "Similar assonances," he adds, "emerge in the most obvious way," namely (*c*) Ode xxi. 3 "grace and joy," which he would trace to an original *χάριν καὶ χαράν*, and (*d*) Ode xxx. 6 "And it (the fountain of living water) came *undefined and unseen...*," where, he says, "the italicized words are quite literally *ἀόριστος καὶ ἀόρατος...*"

(*a*) If *mellēthā* were the rendering of *φωνή*, should we not expect to find instances of this correspondence in the Thesaurus? But in the vast space devoted (coll. 2110—3) to the noun, it is said to represent *λόγος, ῥῆμα, φθέγματα, λαλιά,* and *λέξις*, but not once *φωνή*. Now *φωνή* is to be sharply distinguished from *λόγος*. The Fourth Gospel says that John the Baptist is a *φωνή*, intending us to distinguish that *φωνή* from the *Λόγος*. Ignatius makes the same distinction. As a martyr, in Christ, he will be (he tells us) a *logos*; outside martyrdom, he will be a mere "cry" or *φωνή*¹. Except in very special contexts, *φωνή* would not mean "speech" in the sense of "converse" or "discourse."

What the Poet means is that those aeons which were once silent, now at last, in the sphere of the redemptive Word, or Logos, became themselves *λογικοί*, or *ἐν λόγῳ*. The Fourth Gospel says "Whatever is called into existence in Him," i.e. in the Logos, "was life." This Ode, distinguishing between the creative Logos and the redemptive Logos, says that the silent aeons "*became in the Logos*" in a new sense,

¹ See *Son of Man* 3628 d.

namely, "*in a harmonious concord or converse*,"—something very different from a mere *φωνή* or "cry¹."

(b) As to the alleged assonance between *ἔμφωνα* and *ἄφωνα*, it is disposed of, if the preceding paragraph is correct, because the *thought* is not concerned with *φωνή*. But we may add that *ἔμφωνος*, according to the Greek Thesaurus, is not found in the sound text of any author earlier than Ælianus (c. 250 A.D.).

(c) Ode xxi. 3 "grace and joy" is commented on as being "exactly *χάριν και χαράν*." But are such assonances characteristic of the best Greek religious poetry? The LXX, at all events (which Dom Connolly believes to have been used by the Odist) though it contains many beautiful combinations of *χάρις* and of *χαρά* with other words, never combines the two².

§ 4. "*I believed, therefore I was at rest*"

On this passage Dom Connolly says "I find it hard to believe that we have here a purely accidental coincidence with the LXX." His argument is as follows: "The Ode says, 'I believed, *therefore*,' in the same Syriac words which translate *ἐπίστευσα* δ.ό in 2 Cor. iv. 13 (= Ps. cxv. 1⁴); while in the Psalm neither the Hebrew nor the Syriac version of it expresses 'therefore'."

¹ See *Johannine Grammar* 2596. And note Rom. xii. 1 and 1 Pet. ii. 2 *λογικός*, and Justin Martyr's frequent assumption that God, through the Logos, has made men *λογικοί* (e.g. *Apol.* § 10) with a view to their redemption.

² Another assonance is suggested, *ἀόριστος και ἀόρατος*, as the original of Ode xxx. 6 "[the fountain of living water] came *undefined and unseen*." *Ἀόριστος* is not among the score of epithets of the Spirit in Wisd. viii. 22—3, and it does not occur in the LXX, the N.T., the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists. It is also often used in a bad sense. But I have found it in Clem. Alex. 857 applied to the love of God as being "unlimited." *Thes. Syr.* 2550 gives the Syriac word, with neg., as *ἀπειρος* and perhaps *ἀπέραντος*, but not as *ἀόριστος*.

³ Ode xxviii. 4.

⁴ Ps. cxvi. 10 in Heb. and R.V.

But there are special circumstances to be considered. The Syriac of the Psalm has "I believed *and* I spoke." Aquila has "*because* I shall speak." Field renders the Hebrew "*etiamsi* dicerem." Rashi has "*when* I spoke" (as also has R.V. marg.). R.V. text has "I believe, *for* I will speak." These facts suggest that the writer may be alluding to the quotation, not as being in the LXX, but as being *in an interpretation of the Psalm—one among many interpretations—familiar to Christians through the second Epistle to the Corinthians*, as though the writer said to himself, "The Apostle says that he believed *and therefore he burst forth into speaking*; but 'speaking' must be under the control of the Holy Spirit which must rest on the speaker; so that one might also say 'I believed *and therefore I attained rest*'¹."

It may be argued that a Christian poet, writing in Hebrew, would not be likely to follow Paul in misquoting Hebrew Scripture. But he is not "misquoting"; he is alluding and deliberately varying. We must try to understand the Jewish traditions about "believing" and "resting." They are worth noting here as they bear on other passages in the Odes which connect "belief" with "a song-of-glorifying," and in which we find, latent or expressed, the thought of crossing "great rivers" or passing along a "way" that is "levelled" for "believers" by the Lord—in other words, allusion to the crossing of the Red Sea and the Jordan². The two acts of "crossing" were emblematic of a typical "entering into rest,"

¹ For an allusion in Ode vi. 17 to a phrase used in 1 Thess. v. 12 see *Light on the Gospel* 3747 h.

² Comp. Ode xvi. 5 "I am strong in His song-of-glorifying, and there is to-me *belief* in Him" with xli. 1 "A song-of-glorifying to the Lord [will be uttered by] all His offspring, and they will (?) pour-out-to-the-utmost (or, collect) the truth of His *belief*." Also comp. xxii. 7 "Thy hand hath levelled the way for them that *are-believing* in thee" with xxxix. 4—11 "those who cross them [*i.e.* great rivers] in *belief* are not shaken...and a way has been appointed...for those who agree with (Harnack, *zustimmen*) the Way of His *belief*."

THE INTERPRETATION

partially accomplished by Moses, but completely by Joshua (the first Jesus).

The Epistle to the Hebrews, after quoting—from the Psalms—"that they should not *enter into his rest*," says "We see that *they were not able to 'enter in' because of unbelief*." Substitute "*I*" for "*they*," and take away the negatives, and we have exactly our Poet's thought:—"I *was able to enter in because of belief*," or "I *believed, therefore I attained-rest*¹." Many thoughts like these are collected in the early commentary called Mechiltha on the words that precede the Song of the Red Sea:—"And Israel saw...and they believed in the Lord and in his servant Moses. Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song unto the Lord²." The Hebrew "believe" means radically "make firm," "make stedfast," and the commentary collects instances where this connection is indicated, as in Chronicles, "*Believe* (i.e. make strong) and ye shall be *believable* (i.e. *made-strong*, R.V. *established*³)." There is the same play in the Ode here: "I *believed*: therefore (*lit.* because of that), I *attained-rest*: because *believable* is he in whom I *have believed*." This "belief" implies stability, or "*rest*"; and Mechiltha says that, as a reward for "*belief*," Abraham "inherited this world and the world to come," and "the Holy Spirit *rested* on Israel and they sang unto the Lord."

These thoughts appear to me to have been in the Poet's mind, when he wrote the words under discussion, "I believed, therefore I attained-rest." He was not thinking merely of the perplexing and disputed passage in the Psalm above quoted, nor merely of Paul's quotation of it, but partly also of those

¹ See Heb. iii. 11—iv. 10, which deals with "*rest*" and "*unbelief*." Note, too, the Christian allusion to the first "Jesus" in iv. 8 "For if *Jesus* [*i.e.* Joshua] had given them *rest*."

² Exod. xiv. 31—xv. 1.

³ 2 Chr. xx. 20. R.V. finds the same play in Is. vii. 9 "If ye will not *believe*, surely ye shall not be *established*."

deep consequences of "belief" which were suggested by the Jewish traditions concerning the belief of Abraham before the birth of Isaac, and the belief of Israel at the Red Sea. "Israel burst out into song," the Poet might say, "Yes, but what followed? The Psalmist says, '*Then believed they his words, they sang his praise, they soon forgot his works*¹.' Let me rather think of Abraham, who '*believed*,' but did not '*forget*,' and who, as a reward, entered into the rest of Paradise, '*I believed, therefore also I entered-into-rest*².'"

It may be objected that this is far-fetched: "The Poet ought not to be supposed to have been *consciously* thinking of the Jewish traditions concerning the belief of Abraham. He was expressing his own inner experience, though naturally reminiscences of tradition &c. might accompany the sense of his own experience. To suppose more than this is to suppose what is not natural." My reply would be: "True, it *is* not '*natural*' for *us now*. But it *was* '*natural*' *then* for a poet in the first century, who not only called himself a son of Abraham but also still, even in the light of the Messiah, looked back on Abraham as the Rock of the Old Church, and as the first of the Fathers through whose name God revealed Himself to mankind, calling Himself '*the God of Abraham*³.'"

§ 5. "*Unto thee have I fled, my God*⁴"

It is alleged by Dom Connolly that the Hebrew words for "flee," and their Syriac equivalent, the word here used, are not, so far as he knows, "used metaphorically of fleeing for refuge to, taking refuge in, God; they regularly denote a real

¹ Ps. cvi. 12—13.

² If it were asserted that, in this world, Abraham did *not* "enter into rest," the spiritual Jew would certainly deny this, as he does in *Mechiltha*. See *Light on the Gospel* 3867 "he was at home with God," even when wandering in Palestine.

³ Gen. xxvi. 24.

⁴ Ode xxv. I.

local flight"; and he therefore asks "Is not this a translation of *πρὸς σὲ κατέφυγον* (cf. Ps. cxlii 9)¹?"

But the Syriac word is used in the Hexapla as a rendering of "Many nations shall *flee* (*καταφεύξονται*) *unto the Lord*²." It does not mean merely "flee," but "flee-away," and is appropriately used of "fleeing-away" from the prison of a cruel Master to the House of Freedom³.

On the supposition that the Odist is quoting from the Psalm, we have to remember that the Hebrew "*I have hidden*" is quite exceptionally used with "unto thee." The Targum paraphrases the clause; the Syriac omits it. The LXX *κατέφυγον* indicates that they read נסתי as נסתי "I fled." The root of the latter (נס) is given by Trommius as meaning *φεύγω* 119 times and *καταφεύγω* 7 times⁴. If this is accepted, then the Hebrew *does here exceptionally use flee "metaphorically of fleeing for refuge to, taking refuge in, God,"* and Dom Connolly's objection falls to the ground⁵.

¹ Ps. cxliii. 9, R.V. txt "I flee unto thee to hide me," marg. "*Heb.* Unto thee have I hidden." Walton's Syriac omits the clause.

² Zech. ii. 15 (11).

³ The Heb. (Gesen. 530—1) is simply used of strangers "attaching themselves" to the Lord in Is. lvi. 3, Zech. ii. 15, Jerem. l. 5. The Syriac word used in the Ode, and in Zech. Hexapl., pulls out the notion of *deserting* from heathendom. See *Theo.* 2997 quoting "*ethnicos mores aufugiemus*," Jo. Eph. ccxiv. 19.

⁴ This reading is preferable to חסה "seek refuge." Gesen. 492 *a* says "בסתי...is error for חסתי acc. to LXX *κατέφυγον* SS." It adds "but חסה not constr. wi. אֶל." It might have added "and חסה is never rendered *φεύγω* or *καταφεύγω*."

⁵ Comp. Prov. xviii. 10 "The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous *runneth into it* and is safe." To me there seems much condensed beauty in the Masoretic reading "I hid unto thee," but translators would naturally paraphrase it.

§ 6. "Why is the Greek word for harp always used in the Syriac version of the Odes?"

This question is asked by Dom Connolly in order to suggest the answer, "Because the Odes were written in Greek." But the facts do not suggest that answer, if we do not bind ourselves to a hypothesis that the Odist adhered to some rule about the rendering of the two Hebrew words for stringed instruments, *nebhel* and *kinnōr*, in the Syriac version of the Psalms, a rule that varies according as the two words stand singly, or, as often, coupled¹. The Odist never couples such words. He uses but one word for harp, and this four times, namely, a Syriac transliteration of the Greek *κιθάρα*.

This Syriac *kithra* is found in eight instances (or practically five) in O.T.² In the first instance it represents the Heb. *kinnōr*, occurring in the passage describing Jubal's invention of the "harp" and "pipe³." There it seems to represent stringed instruments as "pipe" represents wind instruments. In Samuel, mentioning "*psaltery (nebhel)*, timbrel (*tōph*), pipe, and harp (*kinnōr*)," Syr. has *kithra* for *nebhel*⁴. So it has in the next instance, "Rejoice in the Lord, O ye righteous.... Give thanks unto the Lord with the harp: sing praises unto him with

¹ It may be added that Aquila and the rest differ both from the LXX and from one another in their renderings of these words. Trommius gives *nebhel* (in the musical sense) as *κιθάρα* (1), *νάβλη* (13), *ναύλη* (1), *νέβελ* (2), *ὄργανον* (2), *ψαλμός* (1), *ψαλτήριον* (7). In Ben Sira xxxix. 15 (? corrupt) "songs of *nebhel* and instruments of strings (?)," LXX has *ἐν ᾠδαῖς χειλέων καὶ ἐν κινύραις*, Syr. "cum laudibus, gratiarum actione, et elata voce," in *ib.* xl. 21 "*nebhel*," LXX has *ψαλτήριον*, Syr. *epōdos* from the Greek *ἐπὶ ᾠδός* (*Theo.* 331).

² *Theo.* gives Gen. iv. 21, 1 S. x. 5, Ps. xxxiii. 2, lxxxi. 2, Dan. iii. 5, 7. Walton gives it also in Dan. iii. 10, 15. Dan. iii. 5—15 contains *verbatim* repetitions, so as to be practically one passage.

³ Gen. iv. 21. The Pesh. Syr. renders "pipe" by *kinnōr*, either misrendering the text, or having a different text.

⁴ 1 S. x. 5. Syr. also has *kinnōr* to represent *tōph*, "timbrel."

the *psaltery* (*nebhel*) of ten strings¹," and in the next, "Take ye up the psalm, and give [forth the sound of] the timbrel, the pleasant harp (*kinnōr*) with the *psaltery* (*nebhel*)," On this passage, the Midrash on *Tehillim* quotes a tradition of R. Asi, quoted by Rashi as from R. Simeon: "Why is it called *nebhel*? Because it *makes-foolish* (i.e. *stultifies*, or *puts to shame*, a form of *nbl*) all [other] kinds of music." Rashi quotes this in a context that indicates a belief that the *nebhel* represented a fuller and grander music than that of the *kinnōr*. In both of these Psalms, the music is not that of an individual worshipper, but that of the nation. They are songs of Israel full of allusions to the Exodus and to the passage of the Red Sea—latent for Gentiles but manifest to the most degenerate Jew³.

I can see no reason why the author of the Odes should not have used the Hebrew *nebhel* and the Syriac translator rendered it as *kithra*. The Thesaurus (3613) gives a picture of this *kithra* as an instrument with ten strings, and this suits the general thought of the Odes, though we must not suppose that the Odist alludes to it literally when he speaks of "a harp of many voices⁴."

¹ Ps. xxxiii. 1—2. A.V. "the psaltery [and] an instrument of ten strings."

² Ps. lxxxi. 2.

³ Comp. Ps. xxxiii. 7 "He gathereth the waters of the sea as an *heap*" (on which see Rashi) with Exod. xv. 8 "as an *heap*," and Ps. xxxiii. 17 "a *horse* is a vain thing" with Exod. xv. 1 "the *horse* and his rider" (on which see *Light on the Gospel* 3795 a). Also note the reference to the Exodus in Ps. lxxxi. 5 "He appointed it in Joseph for a testimony when he went out over the land of Egypt." See Philo (i. 374—5) who after quoting Exod. xv. 1 "the horse and his rider," enters into the allegory of the "lyre" as denoting the harmony of the righteous soul. And Clement of Alexandria (784) says that "the people that is in the act of being saved" may be called a "harp," when "under the inspiration (*ἐμπνεύων*) of the Word and the recognition of God, it glorifies [God]."

⁴ See *Light on the Gospel* 3792 c. I have said little about the transliteration of *κithāra* in the Aramaic of Daniel iii. 5—15 because Levy gives

§ 7. "*Alleged translation from Greek words
with privative alpha*"

(a) The first of these is Ode xii. 5 "for the swiftness of the Word is *indescribable*," lit. "without recounting." This Dom Connolly identifies with ἀνεκδιήγητος. But the Syriac for "without" is really a form of the negative preceded by the relative ("that not"), a form also frequent in New Hebrew. The Syriac may sometimes be used, as will be seen below, to express a Hebrew original like Ps. cxlvii. 5 "To His [*i.e.* God's] understanding *there-is-not number*"—though in that particular passage the Syriac follows the Hebrew. The instances of "*there-was-not* (or, *there-is-not*) *number*" are very frequent in Hebrew. In very few of these does the LXX use ἀναρίθμητος¹. So frequent is the Hebraic phrase "there is no number" that in the present passage we may regard it as pointing to a Hebrew, as against a Greek, original. And if it should be urged that "*number*" is not the same thing as "*recounting*," we may reply that the Hebrew verb whence "number" is derived means "count," "recount," "relate," and that the noun itself is recognised by Gesenius as capable of meaning "*recounting*," or "*relation*"².

no reason to suppose that it could be used in Hebrew. Nor is there space to discuss Joseph. *Ant.* vii. 12. 3 ἡ μὲν κινύρα δέκα χορδαῖς ἐξημμένη τίπτεται πλήκτρῳ, ἡ δὲ νάβλα δώδεκα φθόγγους ἔχουσα τοῖς δακτύλοις κρούεται. Is there any difference between χορδαί and φθόγγοι? The Psalms speak of "ten strings," where does Josephus find "twelve"? "Twelve strings" would favour Clement's view that the "lyre" meant the "twelve" tribes of Israel, the whole harmonious "people (λαός)." But I have found no such allusion.

¹ This may be seen by comparing the numerous instances of "no number" in Gesen. 708—9 with ἀναρίθμητος and ἀριθμός in the LXX Concordance. Sometimes the Heb. is preceded by "until" or "to," *e.g.* 1 Chr. xxii. 4 "and cedar trees *to* there was no number," καὶ ξύλα κέδρινα, οὐκ ἦν ἀριθμός, where the LXX makes no attempt to render the preposition.

² Gesen. 707—9, quoting Judg. vii. 15 R.V. "telling," but Gesen. "recounting," where the LXX has ἐξήγησιν, Luc. διήγησιν. This resembles ἀνεκδιήγητος, when stripped of its negative. On Ps. xix. 1 "the

Note the following instances of the Hebrew "there-is-not":—Deut. xxxii. 4 "a God of faithfulness *and there-is-not iniquity*," LXX καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία, with *v.r.* additional ἐν αὐτῷ, Syr. *et non est iniquus*; Jerem. v. 21 "hear ye this, people foolish and (lit.) *there-is-no heart*," LXX ἀκαρδίας, Targ. and Syr. as Heb., but Syr. substitutes the relative for "and": Ps. civ. 25 "creeping things *and there-is-no number*," LXX ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμός, Targ. as Heb., but Syr., *without* ἔστιν, "that-not"—the form ("dlā") being the same as in Ode xii. 5; Exod. xxi. 11 "she shall go out free *there-is-no money*," LXX ἀνευ ἀργυρίου, Onk. "with-not money," Jer. Targ. and Syr. "that-not money"; Jerem. ii. 32 "days *there-is-no number*," LXX ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμός, Targ. dlā, but Syr. rel. ("d") with negative verb; Hos. iii. 4 (rep. five times) "The children of Israel shall abide many days, *there-is-no prince*, and *there-is-no sacrifice*..." LXX rep. οὐκ ὄντος, Targ. as Heb., but Syr. dlā ("that-not") as in Ode xii. 5.

These facts shew that the Syriac dlā, though it may often represent the Greek privative *alpha* in later Syriac literature, cannot be relied on as representing *alpha* in any earlier literature that may reasonably be supposed to be affected by the Hebrew Bible. The weight of the Greek *alpha* is altogether overbalanced by the weight of the Hebrew "there-is-not."

Nor does the case for the Hebrew stop here. Less than half of it has been represented. Gesenius (pp. 519—20)¹

heavens are *recounting* the glory of God," LXX δηγοῦνται, the Midrash (Wü. p. 171) implies that it *cannot* be "recounted," quoting Ps. lxxv. 1 in the form "To thee silence is praise." Comp. Ps. lxxi. 15 "My mouth shall recount thy righteousness...for I *know not the recountings*," i.e. the numbers thereof (Gesen. 708 b).

¹ See also Gesen. p. 115 for instances of a preposition connected with *bal*, "not," and with the thought of defect or failure, as in Ps. lxxiii. 1 "a dry land *without* water." This word is accountable (Trommius, Heb. Index, p. 19) for the *alpha* privative in ἀγνοσία (1), ἀκουσίως (1), ἀδικως (1), ἀνυδρος (1). In such cases, a detachable Syriac negative is naturally to be explained as from Hebrew, not from Greek.

gives a multitude of instances where the Hebrew "not"—either as *lo'* or as *blo'* ("in-not" or "with-not")—is represented in phrases that have gone far beyond the limits of the Greek *alpha*, e.g. "they made me jealous with a *not-God*," "with a *not-people*," "rejoice in a *not-thing*" (i.e. a thing of naught), "a morning *not-clouds*" (i.e. cloudless), "a waste *not-path*" (i.e. pathless). In these cases LXX seldom has *alpha* privative and often has a confused rendering. The Hebrew use is especially frequent when the negative is preceded by the preposition meaning "in" or "with," "*in-not* righteousness," "*in-not* justice," "*with-not* price," i.e. gratuitously.

(b) Dom Connolly lays special stress on the phrase "*without* (lit. *that-not*) grudging" in Ode xi. 6 translated by Dr Harris (in the Introduction to his second edition, p. 47) "Speaking waters touched my lips from the fountain of God *without grudging* (i.e. *abundantly*)¹." Here, and in Ode vii. 3 "He caused me to know Himself *without grudging*," and xx. 7 "Put on the grace of the Lord *without grudging*," Dom Connolly maintains that the Syriac is "quite inadequate to express 'liberally,' 'freely,' " *which he infers to be the real meaning* "from the requirements of the context and from the literal correspondence of the Syriac phrase to ἀφθότως." The Syriac expression, he adds, "is found as a translation of ἄφθονος, ἀφθόνως, in 4 Macc. iii. 10 (ἀφθόνους πηγάς), and Wisd. vii. 13; and the crudeness of the Syriac in the former case is paralleled by the passages in the Odes."

This argument appears to ignore the following facts. (1) In special contexts, the Greek ἄφθονος, applied to things, may mean "without grudging." (2) There is probably such a special context in Wisdom, but not in Maccabees. (3) Philo, as has been pointed out above, uses ἄφθονος with allusion to sayings of Plato about God's freedom from envy.

¹ Dr Harris has "plenteously" in his text of the second edition (p. 105), which also has (correctly) "fountain of the Lord" (not "fountain of God").

THE INTERPRETATION

(4) Philo, in connection with the Tree of Life mentioned in Gen. iii. 22 "And now lest he [*i.e.* man] put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever," defends God from the charge of "*envy*" or "*grudging*." (5) In Wisd. vii. 13 "I learned without guile and impart her [*i.e.* Wisdom] *without grudging* (*ἀφθόνως*)," the English version, while giving in its text "*liberally*," has in its margin, "or, *without envy*, as in ch. vi. 23." The reference is to "I will bring the knowledge of her [*i.e.* of Wisdom] into light, and will not pass by the truth, neither will I go along with wasting *envy*." (6) Irenaeus, replying to the question "Was not God able to bring forth Man from the beginning perfect?" says that He bestows what is good "*ungrudgingly*¹." (7) Tertullian—apparently following the thought noted above in Philo—describes the devil, in connection with the prohibition to eat of the Tree, as representing that God "*envied* men the property of divinity²." (8) Clement of Alexandria contrasts the Lord, whom "*envy* does not touch," with "another," whom he describes as "*the envier*," in allusion to God and the devil, and to the eating of the tree³.

These facts should be combined with those in the Odes where "*no grudging*," or "*no envying*," is connected with "*knowing the Lord*," with "*the speaking water from the fountain of the Lord*," with "putting on [oneself] the grace of the Lord...and coming into Paradise, and making a crown from His tree," and with "*the knowledge of the Most High*." Thus combined, they seem to me to go beyond indication and to approach demonstration. For the conclusion as to *thought*, in this paragraph, must be distinguished from the conclusion as to *word*, *i.e.* the verbal origin, whether Greek or

¹ Iren. iv. 38. 1—3.

² Adv. Marcion. ii. 10.

³ See Clem. Alex. 832, on which see Mayor quoting Theoph. Aut. ii. 25 "not as though *grudging* (*φθονῶν*)—as some suppose—did God command him not to eat of knowledge."

Hebrew, of the Syriac negations above enumerated. As to the latter, the verbal question, I do not assert that Hebrew origin is proved, but I do venture to assert that Greek origin is not proved nor even made probable. As to the former—the thought—no doubt whatever is left on my mind that the Poet is not thinking of an “*abundant*” or “*plentiful*” fruit of knowledge, or water of knowledge. Like Philo and the author of Wisdom, and the early Christian Fathers—and like Plato too—he is exulting in the revelation that the All-sufficing Father not only gives but also gives “*without grudging*.”

§ 8. *The use of the Syriac relative after substantives to express possession*

(a) It is alleged that “in original compositions by the best Syriac writers,” a suffix would suffice to represent possession, *e.g.* “my-right-hand” in one word. But the Odes have, in at least one passage¹, “the right-hand *that-is-to-me*.” This is a form that “should not be used (in cases where a possessive suffix is grammatically possible) except to give some sort of prominence to the possessor or to emphasize the fact of possession.”

(b) It is alleged that “there is no obvious reason for emphasis—‘my own’—here.” This “indiscriminate employment after a noun, and equivalent to *μου, αὐτοῦ*, in the same position, is frequent in translations from Greek (though not in the earliest) but is hardly met with in native Syriac works.”

(c) It is then alleged that this usage in the Odes cannot be explained from Hebrew: “I cannot think that a Syriac translation from Hebrew of, say, the third or fourth century, would have contained these anomalous constructions; for Hebrew has no detachable possessive particle and relies entirely upon suffixes.”

(d) Eight examples of this “unidiomatic use” in the Odes are given by Dom Connolly.

¹ Ode viii. 21.

THE INTERPRETATION

(a) First, as to the style of the Odes, no one, I think, maintains—certainly I do not—that their Syriac resembles that of “original compositions by the best Syriac writers.” My view—which I hold subject to correction from further evidence—is that it is early Syriac of an uncouth and rudimentary character, and not an “original composition” in Syriac, but translated from Hebrew. The language of the Syriac Odes appears to me to present more resemblance to the pre-literary Syriac Versions of O.T. than to the literary Syriac so copiously represented in the Thesaurus.

(b) Secondly, as to “no obvious emphasis” in the particular passage quoted above, I should be disposed to say that the emphasis is as obvious and as characteristic as in many passages of the Fourth Gospel where Jesus speaks of “my sheep,” “my peace,” “my love,” “my kingdom¹.” The context breathes of God’s Fatherly appropriation of men as His own:—

“For I do not turn my face from *my own*. Because I know them, and before they came into being I observed them (*or*, reviewed them) and their faces [too]. [Yea] I (*emph.*) sealed them (*emph.*). I (*emph.*) framed their members, and *my own* breasts did I prepare for them, that they might drink *my own* holy milk, that they might live thereby. I was well pleased in them, and am not ashamed of them. For *my own* work are they and the strength of my designs. Who therefore will rise up against my work, or who will there be that is not compliant with them? [It was] I [that] willed by my good pleasure and [thereby] formed and fashioned the understanding and the heart; and they are verily *my own*; and *on my own right hand* have I set my elect².”

¹ Jn x. 26, xiv. 27, xv. 9, xviii. 36. In O.T. comp. Cant. i. 6 “*Mine own vineyard*,” better rendered in viii. 12 “*Mine own vineyard*, [the vineyard] *that is mine*.” It is appropriate in Songs of Solomon.

² Ode viii. 15—21, as translated in *Light on the Gospel* 3797—817.

(c) In the next place, the statement that "Hebrew has no detachable possessive particle and relies entirely upon suffixes," though true, is liable to mislead if it causes us to ignore the influence likely to be exerted on translations from Hebrew by the Hebrew use of the relative with the dative pronoun to denote possession. The Hebrew "qui [erat *or* est]" with dative ("'*asher-l*'") is represented in New Hebrew by *shel*, which corresponds in some respects to the Aramaic and Syriac forms in which the relative *d* corresponds to the relative *sh*. The full Hebrew phrase is very widely used. The instances given by Gesenius under the heading of the Hebrew datival preposition all refer to sacred things appropriated to Jehovah, or to Aaron His priest, or to His altar, or to Jehovah's people for whom a sacrifice is to be offered¹. Hence it might well be used in Hebrew Songs to express

"*My own* right hand" appears to me to mean "*my own* right hand which is not like that of an earthly king." Somewhat similarly a distinction of royalty is indicated by this construction of the relative in Hebrew, Targum, and Syriac, but not in LXX, in the instructions given by David for the coronation of Solomon (1 K. i. 33) "Set him upon the mule *that is mine* (lit. *that is to me*)." Here the LXX has (as one might expect) the reduplicated article, not the relative. But the Syriac follows the Hebrew, as also does the Targum, only substituting for the Heb. '*asher-l* respectively the Syriac and Aramaic equivalents.

¹ See Gesen. 513 *b* referring to Exod. xxix. 29, xxxix. 1, 39, Lev. vii. 20, 21, xvi. 6, 15. In these cases, however, the ordinary possessive suffix could not be used, so that the relative phrase was necessary. For others see Gesen. 83 *a*, noting the correspondence of the Biblical '*asher-l* to *shel* which is "in habitual use" in New Hebrew, "as a mark of the genitive."

Schlatter, on Jn i. 41, τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον, calls attention to the emphatic use of *shel* ("his *own* son and not another's") in *Mechilt.* (Wü. p. 277, on Exod. xxi. 31 (Schl. by error xxi. 28)). In *Aboth* (ii. 2) "Rabban Gamliel (lit.) his son [*the son*] *that [belongs] to* R. Jehudah ha-Nasi" is perhaps unique (instead of the usual *ben* followed by the name of the father). Has it anything to do with the fact that R. Jehudah (Taylor) "is said (*Kethuboth* 103*b*)" to have nominated *his own* son to succeed him as Nasi? See below (§ 12) for further details on *shel*, also Gesen. 979 on the relative *sh-*, as being probably not an abbreviation but "an original demonstrative particle," but "in usage, limited to late Hebrew" (not used in the Prophets, exc. Jonah and Lamentations).

THE INTERPRETATION

divine appropriation or possession as above mentioned, and, if so used in Hebrew, it would naturally be retained in an early literal Syriac translation¹. *Shel*, with various suffixes, occurs no less than thrice (*e.g. shellî*, "quod [est] mihi") in the short Song of Solomon, and probably once in the Song of Jacob². There is also an instance elsewhere of *shel* with 1st pers. pl. suffix, meaning "[eorum] qui [sunt] nobis³." It is true that the use of *shel* in Solomon's Song is not an exact parallel. For it supplements, and is not a substitute for, the possessive suffix. Nevertheless it may prepare us for finding in a first-century Hebrew original of the Odes of Solomon somewhat strange combinations of Old and New Hebrew with Aramaic idiom. But in any case the evidence of the LXX, so far as it goes, points to the conclusion that in the Syriac version, the use of the detachable possessive particle would be in accordance with a development of Hebrew precedent, and not derivable from anything correspondent in Greek⁴.

(*d*) I pass to Dom Connolly's eight instances of the unidiomatic expression.

(i) Ode viii. 21 "and at my right hand." This has been shewn above to mean "my own right hand," and therefore to be in accordance with Syriac idiom.

¹ Besides 1 K. i. 33 quoted above, note 2 K. xvi. 13 "the peace offerings that were his own," *i.e.* his own idolatrous invention, where the Targ. and the Syr. follow the Hebrew, but the LXX has the reduplicated article. So, too, in Cant. i. 6, viii. 12 "my vineyard, *that which is mine*" (where the Hebrew has the shorter form *shel*) the Syr. also has the relative and dative, but the LXX has (1) ἐμός, (2) μου ἐμός.

² Cant. i. 6, iii. 7, viii. 12, Gen. xlix. 10 (on which see p. 95).

³ 2 K. vi. 11 "Who of [those] that [belong] to us [is] on-the-side-of (*lit.* toward) the king of Israel?" (Gesen. 513 *b*).

⁴ Gesen. 980 *a*, comparing Heb. *shel* with the corresponding Syriac, quotes Lk. vi. 42 "*my* words," as having the emphatic possessive "*my* words that are to me." This must be an error for Lk. ix. 26. But there Walton gives only the ordinary suffix, and Burkitt gives "ashamed of me, before men, and of *them that are mine*." In the parall. Mk viii. 38 Burkitt gives the ordinary suffix. In Jn x. 26, xiv. 27 &c. SS has the detachable suffix, but omits it in other places where the emphasis would justify it.

(ii) Ode xi. 18 "in thy land." The right rendering is "in *the land that is thine own*." There is a contrast, throughout the Ode, between "the folly that is diffused *over the earth*," man's abode, and the fruitfulness of the abode prepared above by God, God's *own* abode, or "Paradise"—called "*thy* Paradise," "*His* Paradise." This contrast finds expression here. It is said of the evil and corrupt, "They have changed *from darkness into light...from wickedness to the pleasantness that is thine own*; and they turned away the bitterness of the trees from themselves as soon as they were planted in *the land that is thine own*¹."

(iii) Ode xii. 4 "of thy beauty." "Thy" is an error for "his," and Dr Harris's rendering "His own beauty" appears to me to express the Poet's emphasis on the contrast between the beauty above and the beauty below, and also the feeling that all true beauty comes as God's "own" gift.

(iv) and (v) Ode xvii. 12—13 "in my love" and "my blessing." The Messiah is here speaking describing Himself as "the door of everything," and as going to "loose" the "bondmen" whom He calls "His" ("my bondmen"). In such a context, both of the alleged phrases appear to be parallel in their emphasis to Johannine emphatic phrases, such as "the peace that is mine" and "the love that is mine," which might be rendered by the emphatic Syriac form in question². Ought not these parallelisms to lead us to reflect that perhaps the same reason that makes the emphatic *ἐμός*

¹ In Jn xvii. 17 "*thy word* (ὁ λόγος ὁ σός) is truth," Syr. Walton (but not SS) has "thy word [the word] that [is] thine."

² Jn xiv. 27 εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμήν, SS and Walton "peace [the peace] that [is] mine." So Jn xviii. 36 (Walton) "my kingdom [the one] that [is] mine" (SS missing). But in Jn xv. 9 (Walton) "my love [the love] that [is] mine," SS has "my love." Jn uses *ἐμός* in these passages with the article. But it is without the article in Jn iv. 34 ἐμὸν βρῶμα, where SS and Walton have "my food [the food] that [is] mine." *Ἐμός* occurs but twice in the whole of the Epistle to the Romans, whereas it occurs thrice in the brief Epistle to Philemon.

THE INTERPRETATION

so frequent in John, who uses it nearly four times as often as all the Synoptists taken together, may also make the emphatic possessives frequent in the Odes? The Odes, like the Fourth Gospel, are pervaded with the thought of personality—the close personal relations between Man and his Redeemer. The Lord is regarded as saying to those whom He has redeemed “Ye are *my own*,” and each redeemed soul as echoing back to the Redeemer “*my own*—yes, thou, too, art my own¹.”

(vi) Ode xxv. 2 “and my helper.” The context appears to justify us in finding emphasis here: “I was rescued from my bonds and unto thee, O God, did I flee; for thou art the right hand of my Salvation and *the Helper* (lit.) *that is mine own*,” i.e. the Helper that will never desert me, but will be mine for ever. It has been pointed out above² that the words may imply that the redeemed soul is closely united with the Redeemer.

(vii) Ode xxvi. 2 “His holy song.” The context implies that the mouth of the Poet can sing the song that belongs to God because the Poet himself is God’s: “I poured out praise unto the Lord, *because I am His own*, and I will speak the holy psalm *that is His* because *my heart is toward Him*.” Moreover the passage resembles passages like those that speak of “*the holy garments of Aaron*,” where Hebrew, Targum, LXX and Syriac, might all naturally have the relative³. Either of these causes would suffice to defend the relative here on the supposition that the passage is translated from Hebrew.

(viii) Ode xxviii. 9 “but my [suffering of] wrong.” This instance differs from all the rest and admits perhaps of

¹ Compare the first verse of the first Ode, “The Lord is on my head like a crown, nor shall I be apart from Him,” with the last of the last Ode, “They are free men, and they are mine.”

² See § 5 above.

³ Comp. Exod. xxix. 29 where all have the relative, see above, p. 69, n. 1.

a different explanation. The Thesaurus alleges no instance where the word is used with a genitive or possessive suffix, but gives the impression that "*my wrong*," if expressed by the mere possessive suffix, would mean "*my wrong-doing*" (like *ἀδικία μου* in Greek)¹. For this reason the Poet may write exceptionally "the wrong that [is] to me," meaning "the wrong done to me²."

These instances do not necessarily point to a New Hebrew original, although the Syriac idiom is more like New Hebrew than Greek; but on the other hand they do not indicate that the original was Greek. Other instances may perhaps be alleged in future studies of the Odes proving Dom Connolly's conclusion. But these, in my opinion, do not prove it³.

§ 9. "*Until it was given in the midst*"

Dom Connolly argues that these words "could not be a translation from Hebrew, since they contain an unsemitic

¹ See *Thes.* 1478. It gives a feminine form of the word, with a 3rd pers. pl. possess. suffix, as meaning "eorum fraudes," i.e. the wrongs they had done.

² For a similar Hebrew use of *shel* to denote the objective genitive, see *Jebam.* xi. 7 (Mishna) (lit.) "For *his-striking* and for *his-cursing that [belongs] to (shel) this [man]* and *that [belongs] to that [man]*," meaning "For striking and for cursing this man or that." The "his" refers not to the striker but to the stricken (see *Jewish Qu. Rev.* July 1908, p. 728).

³ I have confined myself to Dom Connolly's instances, and am far from asserting that all the detachable possessives in the Odes can be explained on the ground of emphasis. But many can, that do not at first seem emphatic, e.g. Ode xvii. 13 "and I sowed *my fruits* in hearts, and transformed them in myself"—(see *Light on the Gospel* 3874 b)—"and they received *the blessing that is mine* and lived." Here it may be said that there is no more emphasis on "*my blessing*" than on "*my fruits*." I differ. There appears to me to be climax as regards emphasis on personality. In the first clause there is some emphasis on "fruits," which (*Light* 3874 b) means "*my fruitful seed*." The meaning is "I first sowed my fruitful seed in hearts. Thus I transformed them—in myself—into my own nature. And thus they received *the blessing that belongs to my nature*, and passed into life eternal."

⁴ Ode xxx. 6.

idiom, viz., εἰς τὸ μέσον τιθέναι, *in medio ponere*," and he adds "Dr Abbott adduces from Numb. xxx. 5 the phrase 'in the middle'; but there a real local 'middle,' of a carefully specified area, is in question¹." But besides Numb. xxxv. 5, there are other instances of the Hebrew "*in the midst*" (which corresponds to the Syriac²) used absolutely, in such a way as to indicate that it could be employed in New Hebrew absolutely, in a context where a locality is not expressed but only implied³. Now the Ode does imply locality. It begins with the words "Fill ye waters for yourselves from the living fountain of the Lord...and come...and rest by the fountain of the Lord...it gives rest to the soul." Now "rest," in the Odes, implies Paradise—that place of beauty and fruitfulness about which it is said in Revelation that "*in the midst* of the open-place thereof (πλατείας)...there was a river of water of life⁴." Unfortunately the text in Isaiah about idolaters, and "gardens," and "*in the midst*," is disputed; but in any case it is an instance of the absolute use of "*in the midst*"⁵. Rashi takes it as meaning "*in the midst* of the garden," and Ibn Ezra either thus or as "*in the midst* of the idolaters." Either interpretation would, by antithesis, illustrate the present passage. In New Hebrew, this word for "midst" may mean "the inner" as distinct from "the outer" nature⁶, so that there may also be an undercurrent of meaning. Not only is the

¹ *Journ. Theol. Stud.* p. 531. I adduced Numb. xxxv. 5 (not xxx. 5).

² The Syriac word is derived from μέσος, which also exists as a form of New Hebrew as well as Aramaic.

³ "*In the midst*" is used absolutely in Gen. xv. 10, Numb. xxxv. 5, Josh. viii. 22 (*lit.* "to Israel *in the midst*"), Judg. xv. 4, Is. lxvi. 17. Of these, only Numb. xxxv. 5 and Is. lxvi. 17 point to locality. But they are sufficient to shew that the absolute use of the phrase in New Hebrew must have been very early. Delitzsch uses it absolutely in Mt. xiv. 6, Mk iii. 3, Mk xiv. 60, Lk. vi. 8, for ἐν τῷ μέσῳ and εἰς τὸ μέσον and εἰς μέσον.

⁴ Rev. xxii. 1—2. For the connection between "*rest*" and "*Paradise*" in the Odes, see *Light on the Gospel* 3847—83, and especially 3859—64.

⁵ Is. lxvi. 17.

⁶ Levy iv. 631 *b*, 641 *b*, and i. 256 *b*.

"fountain" set as God's gift, "in the midst"¹ of Paradise so that it flows forth to all therein, but it also flows "undefined and unseen," like the Spirit in the "heart," "midst," or "inward" man—so that "until it was given *in the midst* [of the heart] they did not know it²."

This is perhaps too subtle. But an interpretation without any play on words and simply taking "in the midst" to mean "in the midst of Paradise," seems to me far more likely than one that bases itself on an original εἰς τὸ μέσον τιθέναι of which the usual meaning would be "set a prize before all, for all to contest," "propose," "bring forward in public," "make a public contribution." And the use of "give" for "*ponere*" would in itself favour Hebraic origin.

§ 10. "*He was known from before the (lit.)
casting-down of the aeon*"

I pass to a tenth instance, previously alleged by Dom Connolly from Ode xli. 16, which he renders "*from before the constitution of the world*." The words are, he assumes, a Syriac translation of πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου used by the Odist writing in Greek. Καταβολὴ κόσμου occurs ten times in N.T. In seven out of ten cases the Peshitta renders it by the phrase used in the Ode here, "*the casting-down of the aeon*." It is not a phrase used in Hebrew. Hebrew prefers "*founding, or establishing, or creating, the earth, or the habitable-world*." Nor is the phrase used by *Syr. vet.* "Syriac," we are told, "has other words, corresponding to the Hebrew ones, to express

¹ Comp. Jerem. xxxi. 33 "I will give [*i.e.* set as a gift] my law in their inward parts," where the LXX also has "give," but the Syr. has not.

² See *Son of Man* 3362 (i) α—c for ambiguities and plays of words on "*midst*," and comp. Origen (*Comm.* Joann. vi. 15 on Jn i. 26) "there standeth one *in the midst* of you whom ye know not," that is, "*invisible* in His divine nature (ἀόρατος τῇ θεϊότητι αὐτοῦ), being present with every human being and coextensive with the whole universe in its every part." Also note the saying in the Oxyrhynchian Logia "I stood *in the midst* of the world."

³ *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XIV, p. 315.

‘foundation’.” The conclusion is thus put: “How then does it come into the Odes? Obviously as a Syriac translation of *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* by one who was familiar with the usual Peshitta version of this phrase.”

This seemed to me, at the first reading, irresistible. And it still seems to me stronger than any of Dom Connolly's other instances. But in view of the fact that those other instances (in my opinion) point to a Hebrew rather than to a Greek original, and that they include no other alleged instance of allusion to the Peshitta, I was led to examine the subject more thoroughly, and to ask whether we could find any passage in Scripture that represents or suggests a picture of the Creator as preparing for the foundation of the world by some kind of “casting-down.” If we could, it appeared to me that we should be justified in concluding that this alleged single instance affords no proof of a Greek original, or of a translation taken from the Peshitta.

A fallacy seems to me to lie in the assumption that a Christian writer in Hebrew at the end of the first century could not be aware of the Christian use of a remarkable phrase like *καταβολή κόσμου*, which, as we shall see, was variously interpreted in early times. The Greek might be rendered literally, “casting-down”—in connection with God's “*casting-down*,” or “*laying-down*,” of the ground-plan of Creation or “the aeon.” That is what *καταβολή* means here. But *καταβολή* may mean “casting-down” in the sense of “destruction,” and it is so rendered, in the only instance in which Justin Martyr uses it, in T. & T. Clark's translation (“destruction of the Tower”). There was therefore a temptation to paraphrase it. Latin translators called it *constitutio*. Early Syriac translators paraphrased it in various ways, and conformed the phrase to the thought of Biblical Hebrew. But the Greek phrase might be taken in a poetic and allusive sense, and our Poet (I contend) took it thus, and used it literally, poetically, and allusively. Some centuries afterwards

the translators of the Peshitta took it literally, and (probably) not poetically. That is to say, they resorted to this Syriac word merely as a safe and literal translation of a term that they knew to be variously interpreted (as it was for example by Origen and others). Perhaps they regarded it as meaning "established" or "founded." But our Poet apparently does not. This appears from the fact that, when he means "established" or "founded," he uses other words¹.

The following facts shew that the phrase probably attracted attention in early times :

(1) There is no passage in the Gospels where two Evangelists agree in assigning this phrase to Jesus.

(2) Where Matthew quotes it as part of a Psalm, Matthew has "*from the casting-down*," and some readings of Matthew have "*from the casting-down of the world (cosmos)*"; but the Psalm, in the Hebrew, has "*from beforetime*," and, in the Greek, "*from the beginning*"².

(3) Where Luke speaks of blood "*shed from the casting-down of the cosmos*," Matthew has "*shed upon the earth*," which suggests that an original "*from the casting-down*" was misunderstood by Matthew as meaning "from the casting-down [on the earth] of Abel's blood" and expanded by Luke by adding "of the cosmos" so as to make the meaning clear³.

¹ Odes xxii. 12 (Harnack) "Grundlage," xxxv. 5 "Fundament," xxxviii. 17 "Fundament," use a word (*Theo.* 4348) that has no connection with the word we are considering, viz. "casting-down." Our word is used also of (*Theo.* 3928) "casting" or "depositing" seed in the earth (and also in Heb. xi. 11 V.H.).

² Mt. xiii. 35, quoting Ps. lxxviii. 2. Why did Matthew use this paraphrase? Perhaps because, in view of various renderings of the Hebrew, he wished to express the thought of what Jerome calls, not "fundamentum" but "initium fundamenti." Horace might think of it as the rubble, so to speak, cast into the depth of the waters, to prepare a basis for a foundation (comp. Hor. *Carm.* iii. 1. 34—5 "jactis in altum molibus, huc frequens caementa demittit redemptor").

³ Lk. xi. 50; Mt. xxiii. 35 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Matthew would no doubt be influenced by the repeated mention of γῆ in Gen. iv. 10—12.

(4) The Hebrew *kedem* which means "beforetime" is rendered in LXX once "before the aeons"; and, when "from" is added, "from beforetime" is once rendered "before [the] aeon (sing.)¹."

(5) Epictetus bids us regard man as our brother, "who has Zeus for his ancestor, and is, as it were, son from the same seed and from the same casting-down from above²." There is a similar connection certainly in the Epistle to the Hebrews (καταβολή σπέρματος), and perhaps in Clement of Rome³.

(6) Origen and Chrysostom take καταβολή as "casting-down⁴." Jerome⁵ explains it from the phrase "cast (jaciunt) foundations," and points out that the Latin "constitutio" does not exactly express the meaning, which is (he says) not "fundamentum," but "initium fundamenti." This is a very different thing from "constitutio."

(7) Before the first century καταβολή seems to have been used to mean the "putting down" of ready money, the "casting" of seed, the "descent" of fever, disease &c., but not "foundation," except (1) in the phrase "from the bottom," i.e. *de novo*, (2) in special contexts implying foundation⁶. The Thesaurus gives no instance (apart from N.T.) of "before the casting-down," in the sense of "before the foundation of the world."

(8) An earlier Ode connects God's "design" of Re-

¹ Ps. lv. 19, Ps. lxxiv. 12.

² Epict. i. 13. 3, where the Latin has "Coelesti satu editus."

³ Heb. xi. 11, Clem. § 57 οἱ τὴν καταβολὴν (but Lightf. *foundation*) τῆς στασεως ποιήσαντες (the only instance in the Apostolic Fathers (exc. Barn. v. 5 quoting Gen. i. 26 as uttered by God to "the Lord" "from the casting-down of the world")). In Justin Martyr *Tryph.* § 102 ἐν τῇ ἐπὶ τοῦ πύργου καταβολῇ, it prob. means God's "descent" (and not, as in T. & T. Clark's translation, "destruction"). Comp. Gen. xi. 7 "let us go down."

⁴ Origen on Jn xvii. 24, and Chrys. on Eph. i. 4. They are thereby led into strange interpretations.

⁵ Jerome on Eph. i. 4.

⁶ See Steph. *Thes.* quoting (1) phrases with ἐκ and (2) Polyb. xiii. 6. 2, καταβολὴν ἐποιεῖτο καὶ θεμέλιον ὑπεβάλλετο πολυχρονίου τυραννίδος.

demption with "casting-down" under the term "shooting." It is described as being like an arrow that is "*shot*," and also as "like a letter"; and this letter, which has a divine "seal" upon it, is "a great tablet" "wholly written by the finger of God¹." This "seal" is apparently "Truth²," and the vision is connected with the revelation of "the Son of Truth from the Father, the Most High," who "inherited and took possession of everything."

(9) Of the two scriptural passages that describe in poetic detail the creation of the world, one, in Job, expressly mentions God as "*casting-down* (or *throwing*, or *shooting*) the corner-stone," just before He "shut up the sea with doors³." The other, in Proverbs, mentions "the sea" first, and says "When he gave to the sea its bound...when he marked out the foundations of the earth⁴." The former passage suggests the thought of God as "casting down" into the waters a living and growing Stone, the Stone of Truth and Order, which might be regarded by a poet as an "earnest" or "instalment (*καταβολή*)" of the ultimately developed Cosmos, or Harmony of the universe.

(10) According to a tradition in *Joma*, "The Holy One, blessed be He, *threw a stone* into the sea, and from this the world was *founded*⁵." Such a tradition accords with the

¹ Ode xxiii., see *Light on the Gospel* 3887—91.

² See *Light on the Gospel* 3891 *b* quoting Bab. Talm. on a "paper" or "tablet" *falling from heaven*, with "Truth" inscribed on it, whence the inference is drawn "Truth is God's seal."

³ Job xxxviii. 6 R.V. "*laid*," but Heb. "*shot*" or "*threw*." The Hebrew for "*shoot*" in Job is rendered in Targ. and Syr. by the word used in Ode xxiii. 5 "violently-shot." The Hebrew has, as derivatives (Gesen. 435 foll.) the well-known *Tôrah*, "teaching" or "law," as well as fertilising "rain"—so that its associations are far more exalted than we might suppose. Jerome *ad loc.* interprets the "corner-stone" as the Son and the "*shooting*" as referring to the Incarnation.

⁴ Prov. viii. 29.

⁵ *Joma* 54 *b*, quoting Job xxxviii. 6. The thought of God the Redeemer "casting down" the substratum for a foundation is quaintly illustrated by

thought of Job, and of the Odes, especially if we add, from the Ode about the Arrow, the sign of a "seal," and, from the Talmud, that "Truth is God's seal," and, from the Ode again, "He was known from before the *casting-down of the aeon* that He might save souls for ever by *the truth of His name*¹."

(11) It may be worth adding that the Greek word *καταβολή* occurs abundantly in New Hebrew. Its meaning is said to be generally, "mattress," or "covering on which something rests." No instance is alleged (so far as I know) of a metaphorical use². But it may have influenced the use of the term in the earliest Christian literature.

(12) "*The foundation of the world*"—that is to say, the Greek phrase thus rendered in our Authorised Version of Matthew—is rendered very variously in various English Versions of the Gospels. And the variations have a direct bearing on our investigation. For they indicate a danger in such a conclusion as we are now considering, which is, in effect, "*Since the Poet here uses a phrase that occurs in the later Syriac version of N.T., and not in the earlier Syriac versions, meaning 'the foundation of the world,' it follows that he wrote after that later Syriac version.*"

In Mt. xiii. 35, for example, we might infer, that an English author quoting "*from the foundation of the world*" (as A.V. A.D. 1611) and not "*from the beginning(e) of the world(e)*" (as Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva, A.D. 1534—57) wrote after A.D. 1611. But he might be quoting from the Rheims Version (A.D. 1582).

Again, in Mt. xxv. 34, if we inferred from a mention of "*foundations*" that he was quoting, with a slight variation, the

the above-quoted Horatian "*caementa demittit redemptor,*" *i.e.* the contractor.

¹ It must be admitted, however, that the "*shooting*" of the "stone" or the "arrow" is not the same word as the "*casting-down*" in the Ode.

² See Levy iv. 279 *a*. Krauss (pp. 523 and 566) gives more than a dozen instances. He adds (p. 524) one instance of Heb. *καταβλητόν* as meaning "payment of a fine."

Rheims Version (A.D. 1582), we should be wrong again, for "*foundations*" in the plural occurs in the Geneva Version (A.D. 1557).

Lastly, if we inferred from an author quoting Luke xi. 50, "*from the making of the world*" (as in the Rheims Version) that he wrote after 1582, we should be once more wrong. For he might be quoting from Wiclif (A.D. 1380)¹.

In view of these facts it appears to me quite reasonable, as well as charitable to our Poet, to suppose that when he spoke of "*the casting-down of the aeon*," he did not mean what he speaks of elsewhere as "*foundation*," "*founding*," or "*establishing*." The conclusion that the expression is to be taken "obviously as a Syriac translation of *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* by one who was familiar with the usual Peshitta version of this phrase" is also open to this objection, that not one more instance of such "translation" is even alleged in the very able paper to which this Chapter calls attention. The other nine alleged instances of Greek influence appear to me to point either to Hebrew, or at all events not to Greek. And though this, the tenth, points to Greek, it is perfectly compatible with the belief that our Poet wrote in Hebrew. Writing in Hebrew did not preclude him from borrowing thoughts from the Greek of the Gospels any more than from the Greek of Philo².

¹ Compare also Jn xvii. 24, where "before the making of the world" is not only in Wiclif (using "making," as he always does in the Gospels) but also in Tyndale and Cranmer. The facts in (12) are taken from *The English Hexapla*, London, 1841.

² See *Light on the Gospel* (Index "Philo"). It may be added that a poet writing in Hebrew, but versed in Greek, might be influenced in word, as well as in thought, by the flexibilities of the Greek language, so as to strain Hebrew to the utmost in order to express them, *e.g.* in the matter of emphasis and emphatic possessives discussed above in § 8.

§ II. "*The babe leaping*"

After writing as above, I received from Dom Connolly, in the course of an interesting correspondence, the following observation, which he has authorised me to quote: "I wish some one would deal with the N.T. echoes in the Odes. There seem to me to be a number. Perhaps the most striking is that in Ode xxviii. 3 'as a babe that exults in the womb of its mother' (see the Syriac versions of Lk. i. 40)." This alleged "echo" well deserves investigation. I also believe that it is an "echo"—but not an "echo" of anything that is peculiar to the New Testament.

Let us first do justice to the similarity. It is enhanced by the contexts. Luke says "When Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe *leaped in her womb*; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit, and she lifted up her voice with a loud cry and said "Blessed art thou...¹" The Ode in question says "As the wings of the doves over their nestlings, and the mouth of their nestlings toward their mouths, so also are the wings of the Spirit over my heart. My heart is delighted and *leaps* [for joy], like the babe that *leaps in the womb* of his mother²."

I admit that this is very "striking." The obvious inference—obvious at all events to those who assume a Greek original for the Odes—is that the Odist wrote in Greek, and copied from Luke, who says that John the Baptist, as an unborn babe, "*leapt in the womb*" at the approach of the Redeemer who was in the womb of Mary.

But—what about the source of Luke's narrative itself? Grant that it is historical, and that every word of it is exactly true. Still, we may fairly say, "If this experience of Elisabeth is found to be in accordance with something in Jewish traditions about other mothers of Israel, we ought first of all to

¹ Lk. i. 41—2.

² Ode xxviii. 1—3.

examine those traditions. We are all the more bound to do this because the Greek phrase '*leap in the womb*' occurs nowhere in the Bible except as an obvious misrendering of '*push-against-one-another in the womb*,' applied to Jacob and Esau¹. If this 'leaping' or 'exulting'—which really implies an 'exulting' to the glory of God—can be found in fairly early Jewish tradition, applied to unborn babes, glorifying the Lord their Redeemer in return for a special act of His redeeming power, then we ought not to commit ourselves to Luke, or at all events to Luke alone, as the source of our Poet's utterance."

Now we do find language of this kind in very early and widespread Jewish tradition. It is extant in (*inter alia*) the commentary of *Mechilta* on the Redemption of Israel at the Red Sea. *Mechilta* was mentioned above (§ 4) to shew that the very next words in the Ode to those we are now considering ("I believed, therefore I was at rest") probably implied an allusion to the connection between "rest," "stability," and "belief." According to *Mechilta* it was as a reward of "belief" that "the Holy Spirit rested on Israel and they sang unto the Lord." Now we can go still further in the illustration of our Ode with the aid of *Mechilta*, applying it to the "exultation" or "leaping" of the unborn child. For *Mechilta*, on Exod. xv. 1 (Wü. p. 116) "I will sing unto Jehovah," quotes Rabbi Meir (whom Schürer places among the Rabbis of "the Third Generation," about 130—60 A.D.) thus:—

¹ Gen. xxv. 22. The LXX has mistaken רָצַץ, "crush," for a reduplicated form of רוּץ (found as a v.r. in Levy *Ch.* i. 165 *b*). The Heb. רוּץ occurs only in Job xli. 22 (14) where the LXX has mistaken it for רוּץ, and consequently rendered it "run," instead of "dance." On Gen. xxv. 22, Rashi says "Rabbini nostri exponunt...ut significet רָצַץ i.e. *cursum*," because whenever Rebecca passed by a Schoolhouse of Shem, Jacob "ran" (i.e. "*currebat*...ut egrederetur"), and Esau did the same when she passed a place of idol-worship. But the Talmuds and Midrashim are not alleged for this view. *Tehillim* (Wü. i. 327) adopts the usual interpretation "crushed," which Rashi gives as an alternative.

"R. Meir says, *Even the babes unborn* (die Embryonen), which were in the wombs of their mothers, *opened their mouths and uttered the song* before God." This is not the eccentric and unsupported suggestion of a single Rabbi. It is repeated in both the Talmuds, and Rashi assumes it¹.

It may be urged that "opened their mouths and uttered the song" is not the same thing as "*exulted*" or "*leapt*." But we find the Targum on the Psalms using this word "*leap*" as a rendering of the Hebrew for "*psallere*," and it was a very natural way of paraphrasing a word that might raise objection, if taken literally. Indeed, objection is actually raised and answered in the Babylonian *Sota* ("How could the babe see?")². It is worth noting how Origen combines the "*leaping*" of the unborn babe in Luke with an utterance of praise by his mother: "The voice of the salutation of Mary coming-to-pass in the ears of Elisabeth filled John with itself. Therefore John '*leaps*,' and his mother *becomes as it were her son's mouth, and also a prophetess*..."³

I cannot recall anything in Greek profane literature that would induce an early Christian poet writing in Greek to liken his soul to "a babe leaping in his mother's womb," because it "exults" in the motherly love of the Holy Spirit. The poetic tradition attributed to Rabbi Meir about the mothers of Israel at the Passage of the Red Sea sounds genuinely Jewish. It is difficult—I should call it impossible—to believe that R. Meir borrowed "the exultant song of the unborn babes" from Luke; but it is quite intelligible as part of a whole series of what would in English be called ballads, but would be better called, among the Jews, school-poetry—unwritten poetic amplifications of the poetry of the Old Testament, current in the first century and

¹ See *b. Sota* 31 a, *j. Sota* v. 4 (Schwab vii. 287), *Berach.* 50 a, and Rashi on Ps. lxxviii. 26 (as also *Tehillim* ad loc.).

² Ps. xxi. 13.

³ Also see Wagenseil on *Sota*, pp. 617—9.

⁴ Origen, *Comm. Joann.* vi. 30 (Lomm. i. 254).

later concerning that notable Deliverance which was stamped on the Jewish mind by the institution of the Passover. There are other passages in this Ode, that seem to allude to the Exodus or the Wandering in the Wilderness, such as "I have been set on his incorruptible pinions¹" and "I was persecuted and they supposed that I was swallowed up, for I seemed to them as one of the lost²." Others shew us how a Jewish Poet might merge the thought of Israel in the thought of Moses or the Messiah, just as Matthew applies to Jesus part of the saying of Hosea concerning Israel, "Out of Egypt have I called my son....I taught Ephraim to walk," "he took them in his arms³." Into these we cannot enter⁴, but they combine to convince us that we have in the composer of the Odes a man saturated with Jewish tradition, Christianized but not Hellenized, and much more likely to borrow the phrase we are discussing from prevalent first-century Jewish tradition, represented for us in the second century by Rabbi Meir, than from a single Greek instance in Luke of an apparently non-Greek phrase⁵.

¹ Ode xxviii. 6. Comp. Exod. xix. 4 "I bare you on eagles' wings."

² Ode xxviii. 8. Comp. Exod. xiv. 3, xv. 9 "they are entangled..." "my hand shall destroy them."

³ Hos. xi. 1—3, Mt. ii. 15.

⁴ One of them is Ode xxviii. 13 "But I was carrying water in my right hand, and their bitterness I endured by my sweetness." This looks like a Christian view of the much discussed "*tree*," which God (Exod. xv. 25) "*taught*" Moses—not "*shewed*" but "*taught*," says *Mechilta*, in effect, *ad loc.* Wü. "*lehrte ihn*"—near the waters of Marah. See *Indices to Diatessarica* p. xxxv. foll. on the various Jewish and Christian traditions as to this "*tree*"—which Origen interprets as the Cross.

⁵ By "apparently non-Greek," I mean that the Thesaurus, under *σκιρτάω*, not only gives no other instance of *ἐσκήρτησε βρέφος* except Lk. i. 44, but also gives another word (*ἀσκαρίζω*) as the word used by Hippocrates in this sense. As for *σκιρτάω*, it has been shewn above that, as applied by the LXX to Jacob and Esau, it had a meaning alien from Luke's purpose.

THE INTERPRETATION

I have only space for a few words on another similarity, to which Dom Connolly called my attention—between Ode viii. 3 “to bring fruits to the Lord, living, holy,” and Rom. xii. 1 “to present your bodies, a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God.” He added that “*bring*,” not “*bring forth*,” was the meaning of the Syriac.

If we could be certain that the Syr. “*bring*” (the causative of *ētha*, familiar to us in *Maran-atha*) did not mean “*bring forth*,” but “*bring as an offering*,” I should then suggest that the Poet had in view a contrast between (Gen. iv. 3—5) the first two sacrifices—the “*bringing*” of “*the fruit of the ground*” (by Cain) and the “*bringing*” of living animals (by Abel). The Syriac “*bring*” is the same there as here. Cain’s act is traditionally regarded as what one might call “a dead work”; Abel’s, as an act of faith by which—as Philo (i. 200) says—“though dead he still *lives*.” The hypothesis of an allusion to Genesis would enable us to paraphrase the passage in the Ode with its preceding context thus: “Let your worship spring from your heart and from the leaping up of love from the heart to the lips, so as to bring unto the Lord an offering, not of selfish and dead works (like Cain’s) but one that is holy and lives for ever (like Abel’s).”

But the Thesaurus 416—7 gives many instances where Syriac Versions use the causative of *ētha* with “fruit,” to mean “*bring forth*.” Among these are (in Pesh., Palest., and SS) Jn xv. 8, 16, where the “*bringing forth*” of “fruit” by the disciples is described as tending to the “glorifying” of “the Father,” and Jesus says (SS and Pesh.) “I have chosen you and set you that ye should be going [on] *bringing forth fruit*, and *your fruit should remain*¹.” “Remain” implies that their “fruit” will be “living.” Also it must needs be “holy,” for they (Jn xv. 4—6) “*remain*” in “the Vine”; and the Vine is (*Didach.* ix. 2) “the *Holy Vine* of David,” the Vine of the Spiritual Israel.

¹ Jn xv. 16. The Palest. Syr. does not include this verse.

There is no reason, however, why a true Israelite should not be regarded by a Jewish poet as a fruitful tree in two aspects. He not only "*brings forth*" fruit, but also "*brings*" fruit to the Lord *as an offering*. For these reasons, instead of saying that the Poet is echoing the Apostle, I should be disposed to say that both the Poet and the Apostle are going back in thought to Abel's sacrifice, with Cain's in the background. Cain was the type of those who tithed mint, anise, and cummin. Abel was the type of those whose hearts cried out—and whose hands expressed—(Ps. xl. 8) "I delight to do thy will, O my God." Concerning this heartfelt sacrifice of penitence and praise Isaiah represents God as saying "I create the fruit of the lips," and Hosea represents penitent Israel as saying "we will duly-offer *bullocks*, [*namely*] *our lips*"—thoughts echoed in the Epistle to the Hebrews (which speaks of "the fruit of lips that make confession" to God's name) and also in the present Ode¹.

§ 12. *Postscript on the Anaphora of St James*

Dom Connolly's inference from what appeared to him the indiscriminate use of the Syriac detachable possessive in the Odes led me to investigate the matter, in the following circumstances, after most of the preceding paragraphs were in type. In a letter, full of suggestive observations—which I would most gladly discuss did space allow—he asked me to look at some proof sheets of the Syriac Liturgy (Anaphora) of "St James," which he was kind enough to enclose for my inspection. In these, he had underlined passages where the detachable possessive occurs. He pointed out how, in this Syriac, "translated from the Greek (mostly extant) probably in the second half of the 5th century," this detachable possessive "came to be employed almost to the exclusion of possessive

¹ Is. lvii. 19 "fruit," Theod. καρπόν, but not the usual Heb. for "fruit"; Hos. xiv. 2 (on which see Jerome and *Joma* 86 b), Heb. xiii. 15.

suffixes," illustrating his remark by a comparison of such a translation with the Peshitta version of the Psalms where the detachable possessive could hardly be found. He added that even the Peshitta version of the Gospels would shew nothing to parallel the use of the possessive in the document he enclosed, so that the facts confirmed his conclusion that "the Syr. text of the Odes is a relatively late one."

These remarks appeared to me to deserve the most careful consideration, and I have endeavoured to do justice to them. They may lead my readers, as they have led me, to a quite new appreciation of the variations of Christian hymnology in the earliest times, if they will have the patience to go back as far as possible to the original authorities, and the courage to face detailed fact. For of course the first step was to go back to the Greek of the Anaphora. If the Greek contained nothing but unemphatic possessive expressions where the Syriac contained the detachable possessive, then Dom Connolly had proved his point. I therefore turned to Swainson's *The Greek Liturgies*, where the Greek of the Anaphora is printed in four parallel columns, and compared the Greek with the Syriac¹.

I found that the instances underlined by Dom Connolly began a little before the words "This is my body" and were very numerous indeed. Moreover, as to the sacred formula itself, Dom Connolly pointed out that, whereas the Peshitta uses the unemphatic suffix "*my-body*," the Syriac Anaphora has "*the body that-is-mine*" (as also "*the blood that-is-mine*"). Here, however, we have to note that the Greek does not follow the tradition of the Three Synoptists τὸ σῶμά μου, but that of Paul, τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα². Now although the possessive μου, when placed before its noun and the article, ought to be unemphatic and to throw the emphasis on the noun, yet

¹ *The Greek Liturgies*, by C. A. Swainson, D.D. (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1884), to be hereafter referred to as *Liturg.*

² 1 Cor. xi. 24 adds τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. Anaph. adds τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον καὶ διαδιδόμενον εἰς ἄφρασιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

there appeared reasons for thinking that the author of the Anaphora—or at all events the writers of some texts of it—might regard it as *emphatic*¹.

One reason was this, that all through the Anaphora, where there is an antithesis (as there often is) between the goodness and kindness of God and the imperfections and necessities of Man, the Greek writer rarely, if ever, uses the unemphatic expression to signify “His” or “Thy.” Even where there was no such antithesis, I have failed (so far) to find *the unemphatic form, in Greek, to signify divine possession*. In the Pauline tradition there was a reason for the unemphatic “my” applied to “body,” because Paul meant to emphasize “[body] *that is for you*,” reserving the personal emphasis for “*my own* commemoration” and “*my own* blood” in the following context². But the Greek writer of the Anaphora, who blends

¹ See *Johannine Grammar* 2776—84 on “The Possessive Genitive.” When the genitive pronoun comes *between* the article and its noun, it is emphatically reverential, *Liturg.* p. 260 τῶν ἀρχάντων σου μυστηρίων, ἰθ. τὸ ἅγιόν σου...θυσιαστήριον. But see below for variations in the texts indicating that the Greek possessive, even when preceding the article, may have been regarded by the scribes of the Anaphora as emphatic.

In Dom Connolly's Syriac text of the Anaphora, the order of the words is “This *that-which-is-mine* is the body,” representing exactly the order of the Pauline formula, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα. I am informed by Rev. G. Margoliouth that this is the order of the Syriac in the Liturgy of St John the Evangelist (*c.g.* Brit. Mus. MSS Or. 2293 and 2295), but that in the Anaphora of St James the Brother of the Lord, the reading in the MSS referred to is “This [is] my-body that-is-for-you,” and that, in the printed texts (Rome, 1592 and 1843) a unified form of the words has been employed, the reading in every Anaphora being: “This is the-body [*the body*] *that-is-mine*” (apparently influenced by the Harklensian version, in which the Syriac “*that-which-is-mine*” comes last)—not only in the Gospels, where μου comes last, but also in the Epistle to the Corinthians, where μου does not come last.

² 1 Cor. xi. 24—5 may be paraphrased as meaning “This is the body that-I-give-you (τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα) which [is offered] in your behalf (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν): do this with-a-view-to (εἰς) the commemoration of me (emph.) (τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν)...This cup is the new testament (*or*, covenant) in my-own (emph.) blood (ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι).”

the Pauline with the Synoptic tradition, has not "my own (τὸ ἐμὸν) blood," but τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα¹. It is not improbable that the Greek writer in both cases regarded the μου as emphatic. It is at all events highly probable, if not certain, that the Syriac translator would regard it as emphatic, and would represent it by the Syriac detachable possessive which represents our reverential "Thy," "His," and (in modern hymnology) "My."

There is all the more excuse for the Syriac translator (if he is wrong) because, even as regards the sacred formula, the different MSS of the same Liturgy sometimes vary. For example, in the Liturgy of Alexandria, one Codex has τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου (with the Synoptists), but two others τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα (with Paul)². A Liturgy of Saint Basil also has the Synoptic form³. Both these Liturgies, in all the MSS, add some version of the clause τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, which is not in the Synoptists. Both also have the same possessive form, in their various MSS, for "the body" and "the blood." But the Liturgy of Saint Chrysostom has the Pauline form for "the body" and the Synoptic form for "the blood"⁴.

The unemphatic Greek possessive in the Anaphora occurs in such expressions as "Purify my lips and heart" and "Sanctify our souls and bodies and spirits"⁵; but a cursory glance at several pages of Swainson's edition has revealed no other instances. For the most part, even when the Greek writer is using "our" or "my" about men, he uses the emphatic form where there is contrast (as there often is)

¹ *Liturg.* pp. 274—5.

² *Liturg.* pp. 52—3. They also vary as to αἷμα similarly.

³ *Liturg.* p. 82.

⁴ *Liturg.* p. 129. So also has a "Liturgy of Saint Basil" on p. 160.

⁵ *Liturg.* pp. 256, 262. That is because there is an emphasis on the nouns as distinct from the possessive. In the former sentence, ἐξάλειψόν μου τὰ παραπτώματα is the reading of two MSS, but a third omits μου and a fourth has it at the end of the clause.

between Man and God, or else the neutral form¹. In Eucharistic Liturgies there must needs be a pervasive emphasis of pronouns in contrasts between God's kindness and helpfulness and Man's unworthiness and helplessness².

It is quite true that in the Syriac Version of the Old Testament the detachable Syriac possessive is extremely rare. But there is good reason for the rarity. The Hebrew Scripture, even where it emphasizes the contrast between what is God's and what is Man's, does not use *shel*, which might have enabled the Psalmist to express emphasis. The Biblical Hebrew, therefore, leaves it unexpressed. The LXX follows the Hebrew. The Syriac follows the Hebrew or the LXX. The result is that in the Old Testament and its most ancient versions the contrast of thought is left unexpressed by grammatical inflexion.

But when the first century brought into Jewish literature the thoughts that gathered round the belief in the Incarnation, then the contrast between the love and kindness that came down from God to Man, and the helplessness and sinfulness that went up in appeal from Man to God, would require altogether new forms of expression. And these would naturally spring into greatest prominence in Christian Liturgies. We have above noted one phase of this development,

¹ *Liturg.* pp. 262 and 265 τὰς νοερὰς ἡμῶν ὄψεις τοῦ ἀπεριλήπτου φωτὸς πλήρωσον may at first sight be regarded as emphatic without contrast. But that contrast is *implied* may be seen by comparing p. 264, where the same expression occurs, only with σου inserted before φωτὸς ἀποπλήρωσον. There is a contrast in all the passages—expressed or implied—between “our” and “Thy.”

² Comp. *Liturg.* p. 256, “Reject not *my* (τὴν ἐμὴν) unworthiness... according to *thy* great mercy (τὸ μέγα ἐλεός σου, Paris MS 476 τὸ μέγα σου ἐλεός),” *ib.* p. 258 “Not in *our* righteousness (ταῖς δικαιοσύναις ἡμῶν) do we trust but in *thy* good mercy (ἐπὶ τῷ ἐλέει σου τῷ ἀγαθῷ),” *ib.* p. 264 “having deemed me, *thy* sinful servant, worthy to stand at *thy* holy altar,” where Rot. Mess. has τὸν...σου δοῦλον, but Paris MS 476 τὸν...δοῦλόν σου, *ib.* p. 276 “Requite us not according to *our* iniquities (τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν) but according to *thy* kindness (κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἐπιείκειαν).”

when comparing the brief and original form—neither emphatically personal nor yet unemphatic—of the sacramental words of Institution, as recorded by the Synoptists, with the newer and amplified form given in the Pauline tradition. The latter, we found, emphasizes, first, the sacrificial nature of the gift of “the body,” and then the personal nature of the “commemoration.” The Greek Anaphora carries further this development. We may take, as a verbal test of Eucharistic emphasis—as a kind of Eucharistometer—the use of the emphatic personal “Thy” (σός) applied to the Lord. It occurs less than a dozen times in the LXX version of the Psalms¹. But it occurs twice or thrice in the first few lines of most MSS of the Anaphora². This confirms the conclusion that, in the Anaphora, the Syriac emphatic rendering springs, not from an indiscriminate use of the detachable possessive, but from a desire to render literally the original Eucharistic thought.

With such thought—the thought of Eucharistic contrast—the Odes of Solomon are from first to last imbued. We are therefore safe in saying that in a very great number of cases the Syriac detachable suffix is no more indiscriminate in the Odes than in the Anaphora. But can we go further and conclude that the Syriac Translator of the Odes, when using these possessives, may be literally translating from Hebrew? On that point more evidence is necessary, not only as to the usage of what is generally called Mishnic Hebrew³, but also

¹ This includes all uses in the Psalms.

² *Liturg.* pp. 256—7. The texts vary slightly. (One MS has πολλήν for σήν.) It occurs also once or twice on pp. 258—9 (where again the texts vary), thrice on pp. 270—1 &c. In the Apostolic Fathers—apart from Hermas (who uses it in precepts about “one’s own wife” &c.)—σός occurs (as an adjective with noun) only in Clem. Rom. § 60 τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας (a quasi-Eucharistic prayer), and *Didach.* ix. 4, x. 5 (rep.) εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν (in the actual Eucharist).

³ We have to bear in mind that, even after the exile, Biblical Psalms—and some of the most beautiful of them—were still composed in

as to the kind of Hebrew that would be written in the first century by a Jewish poet writing in the name of Solomon, and in a tone very different indeed from that of the extant Psalms of Solomon, and resembling in some respects the tone of Solomon's Song in the Bible.

If we were to trust merely to the evidence of the Prayers of ancient post-Christian Rabbis recorded in the Talmud, it would appear that even in contrasts between God's kindness and Man's need, the Rabbis contented themselves with the ordinary Hebrew suffix without using the detachable particle¹.

But in the Jewish Thanksgiving after Meals—which (I am informed) is of very great antiquity—the divine “His” is expressed by a form of *shel* thus: “we have eaten of *that-which-is-His*.” And Levy quotes, from the Jerusalem as

Hebrew, not in Aramaic. What is called “Mishnic Hebrew” was not invented by those who uttered the earliest of the sayings known to us as Mishna. It was merely one form of literary Hebrew—namely, that form which had come into use, by the second century, among Rabbis teaching in the schools. Even in the Talmuds there are great differences of style. The prose of legal discussion may be found intermixed with the poetry of a soaring imagination or extravagant fancy. The Hebrew of the Odes of Solomon (if they were composed in Hebrew) may have been as different from the Hebrew of the more prosaic parts of the Mishna as the English of Marlowe from the English of Bishop Burnet.

¹ See the Prayers in *Berach.* 16 *b* foll. They contain (as far as I have seen) no instance of a reverential “Thy” &c. represented by anything more than the possessive suffix. Several of them begin with “May there be a will (or, good-pleasure) from-before-thy-face” (Goldschmidt and Schwab “*thy will*”). In the prayer of “Rabh” for “a life of peace, a life of good, a life of blessing...,” “of” is represented in each case by *shel*.

² *Jewish Prayer Book*, ed. Singer, p. 279 “Blessed be (our God) he of whose bounty we have partaken,” but *lit.* “Blessed be He [as to] whom (שׁו) we have eaten *from-that-which-is-His* (מִשְׁלוֹ).” The form in the Mishna of *Berach.* vii. 3, repeating the grace several times—with variations adapted to the numbers present—does not contain the italicised words, except partially at the last two repetitions, where it has “for that which we have eaten.”

On the use of *shel* with suffix as a possessive pronoun, a few remarks

THE INTERPRETATION

well as from the Babylonian Talmud, words ascribed to God as follows "Slay [the sacrifices, or beasts] *that-are-mine* in *that-which-is-mine* [i.e. in my Temple] and *that-which-is-thine*

may be found in Albrecht's *Neuhebraische Grammatik*, 1913 pp. 56—7, but the subject is much more fully treated in an Article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1908, Vol. XX, No. 80, pp. 647—737 on Mishnaic Hebrew, by the Rev. Moses H. Segal. He gives abundant instances of Hebrew "circumlocution of the genitive," with and without "anticipation," and speaks (p. 724) of the use of *shel* as very ancient. Of Mishnaic "circumlocution with anticipation" he says (p. 728) "generally the construction has an emphatic force"; but (p. 731) "gradually the idiom began to be used more frequently, and then regularly whenever any stress was to be laid upon a noun, and, in the course of time, even where no emphasis was intended."

"In about forty passages in the Mishna," he adds (p. 732), "and frequently in the Midrashim, circumlocution by שֶׁל with the appropriate suffix is found in the place of the possessive suffix attached immediately to the noun itself. This construction is used (a) on grounds of grammar, where, namely, the noun cannot take the suffix through being indeclinable or consisting of a compound expression, and (b) on grounds of style, where it is desirable to leave the noun unchanged for the sake of lucidity or emphasis."

Almost all Mr Segal's instances are taken from the Mishna, where we cannot expect poetic expression. The impression left by his laborious research is that if it had extended to the poetic and mystical portions of the Midrashim, it might have given us instances like that in *Sabbath* 104 a (Goldschmidt) "He, Vay, das ist der Name des Heiligen...", where the literal Hebrew has "He, Vaw, this is His name [*the name*] *that* [*belongs*] *to* (*shel*) the Holy One..." In *Gen. r.* (on Gen. xxviii. 11, as quoted in *Levy* iii. 219 b)—where reasons are given for calling God PLACE—*shel* is used with "the Holy One," and with "His world": "Why do they form [as they do] His Name [the Name] *that* [*appertains*] to the Holy One and call Him PLACE? Because He is its-place [the place] *that* [*appertains*] to His world." That is, the world is included in Him; He, though in His world, is not included in it. But *shel* is not used with "Him" in what follows: "We should not know whether the Holy One [is the] place of His world, or whether His world [is] His place; but, from that which is written (Exod. xxxiii. 21) 'See, [there is] place with me,' it follows that the Holy One [is] its-place [the place] *that* [*appertains*] to [the] world, and not [that] His world [is] *His place*." The antithesis, to be exact, would require at the close—instead of "*His place*"—"His place [*the place*] *that* [*appertains*] to Him." But, either as being too lengthy, or for some other reason, it is avoided.

in *that-which-is-thine* [i.e. in thine own house]¹." We have seen above that *shel* occurs thrice in the short Song of Solomon which is written in Hebrew. Moreover in the Song of Jacob—instead of "until *Shiloh* come"—most ancient authorities agree in reading some form of *shel*, meaning "that [kingdom] which [is reserved] for Him," or "He for whom [the kingdom &c. is reserved]²." Is it unreasonable that, in attempting to account for the very numerous emphatic pronominal contrasts in the Odes of Solomon, expressed by the Syriac relative, those who are taking a Hebrew original as their working hypothesis should say that an explanation may be first sought—at all events in some instances—in the Hebrew *shel*?

It must be admitted, however, that as to some phrases, hallowed by old Hebraic usage, it is difficult to believe that a poet writing in later Hebrew would resort to the form *shel*, as for example in the phrase "*Thy* right hand"—even when it was emphatically contrasted with the feebleness of "the right hand" of Man. But what follows? Grant that the Poet, in a phrase of contrast, wrote, in Hebrew, "thy right hand" with the simple Hebrew suffix. Would not a translator, whether into Greek or Syriac, feel that the emphasis on "thy," though manifest to Jews, required to be brought out distinctly in a translation for Gentiles? Some of them, being idolaters, might even think of "thy right hand" as being distinct from "thy left hand" or "thy foot" or some other member of their God. Even by the more intelligent the full

¹ Levy iv. 556 *b* quoting *j. Abod. sar.* V, 45 *b* and *Kidd.* 57 *b*. It is interesting to note that in the Prayer of Jesus—represented differently in Mark xiv. 36 οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω..., Mt. xxvi. 39 οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω..., Lk. xxii. 42 μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου....—SS has "Not *my will*, *that-which-[is]-mine*...but *that-which-[is]-thine*," in all three Gospels.

² Gen. xlix. 10, LXX and Theod. τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ. But *al. exempl.* ὃ ἀπόκειται, as Onk. "the Messiah *whose is the kingdom*," and the Peshitta "*He whose it is*."

force of the Hebrew suffix would probably not be felt. A Syriac translator, faithful even to baldness in other respects, might well deviate in this one respect from a Hebrew original, expressing faithfully with his pen what the writer of the Hebrew would expect his readers to express with their voice.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

PUBLISHED BY ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.

CLUE: A Guide through Greek to Hebrew
Scripture (Diatessarica—Part I).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (post free 7s. 10d.)

THE CORRECTIONS OF MARK (Diatessarica—Part II).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 15s. net. (post free 15s. 5d.)

FROM LETTER TO SPIRIT (Diatessarica—Part III).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 20s. net. (post free 20s. 5d.)

PARADOSIS (Diatessarica—Part IV).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (post free 7s. 10d.)

JOHANNINE VOCABULARY (Diatessarica—Part V).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 13s. 6d. net. (post free 13s. 10d.)

JOHANNINE GRAMMAR (Diatessarica—Part VI).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 16s. 6d. net. (post free 16s. 11d.)

SILANUS THE CHRISTIAN.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (post free 7s. 10d.)

APOLOGIA: An Explanation and Defence.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net. (post free 2s. 10d.)

NOTES ON NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM
(Diatessarica—Part VII).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (post free 7s. 10d.)

INDICES TO DIATESSARICA.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net. (post free 2s. 10d.)

THE MESSAGE OF THE SON OF MAN

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 4s. 6d. net. (post free 4s. 10d.)

PUBLISHED BY THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

THE SON OF MAN (Diatessarica—Part VIII).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 16s. 6d. net. (post free 17s.)

LIGHT ON THE GOSPEL FROM AN ANCIENT POET
(Diatessarica—Part IX).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 12s. 6d. net. (post free 12s. 11d.)

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL, INTRODUCTION
(Diatessarica—Part X, Section I).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net. (post free 2s. 10d.)

Cambridge :

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (II)
CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

For a list of previous parts of *Diatessarica*,
see pp. 196—7 of this treatise.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

London: FETTER LANE, E.C.

Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET



New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

Bombay, Calcutta and Madras: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.

Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (II)
CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

BY

EDWIN A. ABBOTT

Honorary Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge

Fellow of the British Academy

Cambridge:
at the University Press
1915

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PREFACE

THIS treatise—a chapter in a forthcoming volume of Diatessarica to be entitled *The Law of the New Kingdom*—is here published in advance, separately, in the hope that it may receive criticism resulting in corrections and improvements, and that it may reach some who would not be likely to read the larger and more expensive work.

Additional evidence is alleged in it for the conclusion—arrived at in previous parts of Diatessarica—that where Luke alters or omits what is in Mark, John as a rule intervenes to support or explain Mark. But its main object is to investigate what may be called Christ's Doctrine of Bread. It gives reasons for believing that the Eucharist of the Last Supper was the outcome and climax of earlier meals that were not only eucharistic but also altruistic. They expressed a divine Law of giving and receiving. They reinforced, in a material emblem with a spiritual application, Isaiah's precepts to Israel, "Break thy bread and draw out thy soul to the hungry," as conditions to be fulfilled by every human being that desires to receive for his own hungry soul that bread which is broken for him by the Son of Man.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

Wellside, Well Walk
Hampstead, N.W.
12 July 1915.

CONTENTS

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS	PAGE
	ix
CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING	
§ 1 The complexity of the evidence	I
§ 2 Traces of metaphor underlying the narratives about the "baskets"	7
§ 3 The immediate sequel of John the Baptist's death .	14
§ 4 "And he saith unto them, Come ye...and rest a little," in Mark	17
§ 5 "Come ye, [by] yourselves, apart, into a desert place," in Mark	21
§ 6 The concourse of "many," in Mark	24
§ 7 "They had no leisure so much as to eat," in Mark	31
§ 8 "To a desert place apart," in Mark and Matthew .	35
§ 9 "In the boat," in Mark	39
§ 10 Signs of conflation in Mark	41
§ 11 "On foot," in Mark and Matthew	43
§ 12 "He had compassion," in Mark and Matthew . . .	45
§ 13 "They were as sheep not having a shepherd," in Mark and Matthew	50
§ 14 "Shepherd" (<i>sing.</i>) nowhere mentioned by Luke .	52
§ 15 "And he began to teach them many things," in Mark	54
§ 16 "When the day was now far spent," in Mark . . .	59
§ 17 "They continue with me now three days," in Mark and Matthew	61
§ 18 "Buying" or "Whence?"	67
§ 19 "Two hundred pennyworth," in Mark and John .	72
§ 20 "How many loaves have ye? Go [and] see," in Mark	81
§ 21 "There is a lad here," in John	84
§ 22 "Here," in all the Gospels	92
§ 23 "By companies," "by ranks," in Mark	94
§ 24 "On the green grass," in Mark	100
§ 25 "By hundreds and by fifties," in Mark	107

CONTENTS

	PAGE
§ 26 "Taking," "blessing," and "looking up to heaven" . . .	113
§ 27 "Breaking in pieces" or "breaking"	119
§ 28 "And the two fishes he divided among [them] all," in Mark	126
§ 29 "Twelve basketfuls" (R.V.), in Mark	134
§ 30 "They that ate the loaves," in Mark	142
§ 31 "Five thousand men" or "about five thousand [men]" . . .	146
§ 32 Irenaeus and Origen on the "five thousand" in the Acts, and Clement of Alexandria on the "five loaves" . . .	150
§ 33 "Give ye them to eat," why omitted by John	153
§ 34 "Eating" in the presence of the Lord	155
§ 35 "That he should give something to the poor," in John . . .	158
§ 36 "We all partake of the one loaf"	161
§ 37 "Jesus . . . taketh the loaf and giveth to them," in John . .	163
§ 38 Christ's "leaven"	168
§ 39 The passionateness of the Eucharist	173
§ 40 The "kiss of love"	176
§ 41 "Testament" or "Covenant"	182
§ 42 "Testament" in the Gospels	190

REFERENCES

- (i) *a.* References to the first nine Parts of Diatessarica (as to which see pp. 196—7) are by paragraphs in black Arabic numbers :—
- 1— 272 = *Clue.*
 273— 552 = *Corrections of Mark.*
 553—1149 = *From Letter to Spirit.*
 1150—1435 = *Paradosis.*
 1436—1885 = *Johannine Vocabulary.*
 1886—2799 = *Johannine Grammar.*
 2800—2999 = *Notes on New Testament Criticism.*
 3000—3635 = *The Son of Man.*
 3636—3999 = *Light on the Gospel from an ancient Poet.*
- (i) *b.* References to the Sections of the Tenth Part of Diatessarica, entitled *The Fourfold Gospel*, are by pages. The three Sections now completed are :—
- (Section 1) *Introduction.*
 (Section 2) *The Beginning.*
 (Section 3) *The Proclamation of the New Kingdom.*
- (ii) The Books of Scripture are referred to by the ordinary abbreviations, except where specified below. But when it is said that Samuel, Isaiah, Matthew, or any other writer, wrote this or that, it is to be understood as meaning *the writer, whoever he may be, of the words in question*, and not as meaning that the actual writer was Samuel, Isaiah, or Matthew.
- (iii) The principal Greek mss are denoted by **N**, A, B, etc.; the Latin versions by *a*, *b*, etc., as usual. The Syriac version discovered by Mrs Lewis on Mount Sinai is referred to as SS, *i.e.* "Sinaitic Syrian." It is always quoted from Prof. Burkitt's translation. I regret that in the first three vols. of Diatessarica Mrs Lewis's name was omitted in connection with this version.
- (iv) The text of the Greek Old Testament adopted is that of B, edited by Prof. Swete; of the New, that of Westcott and Hort.
- (v) Modern works are referred to by the name of the work, or author, vol., and page, *e.g.* Levy iii. 343 *a*, *i.e.* vol. iii. p. 343, col. 1.

ABBREVIATIONS

- Aq. = Aquila's version of O.T.
 Brederék = Brederék's *Konkordanz zum Targum Onkelos*, Giessen, 1906.
 Burk. = Prof. F. C. Burkitt's *Evangelion Da-mepharreshe*, Cambridge University Press, 1904.
 Chr. = *Chronicles*.
 Clem. Alex. 42 = Clement of Alexandria in Potter's page 42.
 Dalman, *Words* = *Words of Jesus*, Eng. Transl. 1902; *Aram.*
G. = *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, 1894.
 En. = Enoch ed. Charles, Clarendon Press, 1893.
 Ency. = *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, A. & C. Black, 1899.
 Ephrem = Ephraemus Syrus, ed. Moesinger.
 Etheridge = Etheridge's translations of the Targums on the Pentateuch.
 Euseb. = the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.
 Field = Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, Oxford, 1875, also Otium Norvicense, 1881.
 Gesen. = the Oxford edition of Gesenius.
 Goldschm. = *Der Babylonische Talmud*, 1897—1912, ed. Goldschmidt.
 Goodspeed = Goodspeed's *Indices*, (i) *Patristicus*, Leipzig, 1907, (ii) *Apologeticus*, Leipzig, 1912.
 Hastings = Dictionary of the Bible, ed. Hastings (5 vols.).
 Hor. Heb. = *Horae Hebraicae*, by John Lightfoot, 1658—74, ed. Gandell, Oxf. 1859.
 Iren. = the treatise of Irenaeus against Heresies.
 Jer. Targ. or Targ. Jer. (abbrev. for Jerusalem Targum), or Jon. Targ. (i.e. Targum of Jonathan, abbrev. for the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan) = the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch, of which there are two recensions—both quoted (*Notes on N.T. Criticism*, Pref. p. viii) by ancient authorities under the name "Jerusalem Targum." The two recensions are severally denoted by Jer. I and Jer. II. On other books, the Targum is referred to as simply "Targ."
 Jon. Targ., see Jer. Targ.
 Justin = Justin Martyr (*Apol.* = his First Apology, *Tryph.* = the Dialogue with Trypho).
 K. = *Kings*.
 Krauss = Krauss's *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter* etc., Part II, Berlin, 1899.

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Levy = Levy's *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, 4 vols., Leipzig, 1889; Levy Ch. = *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols., 1881.

L.S. = Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

Mechilta, see Wü(nsche).

Onk. = the Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch.

Origen is referred to variously, e.g. *Hom. Exod.* ii. 25 = lib. ii. ch. 25 of *Hom. Exod.*, but Orig. on *Exod.* ii. 25 = the commentary *ad loc.*; Lomm. iii. 24 = vol. iii. p. 24 of Lommatzsch's edition.

Oxf. Conc. = *The Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint*.

Pec. = peculiar to the writer mentioned in the context.

Pesikta, see Wü(nsche).

Philo is referred to by Mangey's volume and page, e.g. Philo ii. 234, or, as to Latin treatises, by the Scripture text or Aucher's pages (P. A.).

Pistis = *Pistis Sophia*, ed. Petermann (marginal pages).

Ps. Sol. = *Psalms of Solomon*, ed. Ryle and James, Cambr. 1891.

R., after Gen., Exod., Lev. etc. means *Rabboth*, and refers to Wünsche's edition of the Midrash on the Pentateuch, e.g. *Gen.* v. (on Gen. xii. 2, Wü. p. 177).

Rashi, sometimes quoted from Breithaupt's translation, 1714.

S. = *Samuel*; s. = "see."

Schöttg. = Schöttgen's *Horae Hebraicae*, Dresden and Leipzig, 1733.

Sir. = the work of Ben Sira, i.e. the son of Sira. It is commonly called *Ecclesiasticus* (see *Chue* 20 a). The original Hebrew used in this work is that which has been edited, in part, by Cowley and Neubauer, Oxf. 1897; in part, by Schechter and Taylor, Cambr. 1899; in part, by G. Margoliouth, *Jewish Quart. Rev.*, Oct. 1899 (also printed in *About Hebrew Manuscripts* (Frowde, 1905) by Mr E. N. Adler, who discovered the missing chapters).

SS, see (iii) above.

Steph. Thes. = Stephani *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (Didot).

Sym. = Symmachus's version of O.T.

Targ. (by itself) is used where only one Targum is extant on the passage quoted.

Targ. Jer., Targ. Jon., and Targ. Onk., see Jer. Targ., Jon. Targ., and Onk., above.

Tehillim = Midrash on Psalms, ed. Wünsche (2 vols.).

Test. xii Patr. = Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs ed. Charles, 1908 (Gk., Clarendon Press, Eng., A. & C. Black).

Theod. = Theodotion's version of O.T.

Thes. Syr. = Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus*, Oxf. 1901.

Tromm. = Trommius' *Concordance to the Septuagint*.

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Tryph. = the Dialogue between Justin Martyr and Trypho the Jew.

Walton = *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, 1657.

Wetst. = Wetstein's *Comm. on the New Testament*, Amsterdam, 1751.

W.H. = Westcott and Hort's New Testament.

Wü. = Wünsche's translation of *Rabboth* etc., 1880—1909 (including *Mechilta*, *Pesikta Rab Kahana*, *Tehillim* etc.).

(a) A bracketed Arabic number, following Mk, Mt., etc. indicates the number of instances in which a word occurs in Mark, Matthew, etc., e.g. ἀγάπη Mk (o), Mt. (1), Lk. (1), Jn (7).

(b) Where verses in Hebrew, Greek, and Revised Version, are numbered differently, the number of R.V. is given alone.

(c) In transliterating a Hebrew, Aramaic, or Syriac word, preference has often, but not invariably, been given to that form which best reveals the connection between the word in question and forms of it familiar to English readers. Where a word is not transliterated, it is often indicated (for the sake of experts) by a reference to Gesen., *Thes. Syr.*, Levy, or Levy *Ch.*

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

[Mark vi. 29—44, viii. 1—9, viii. 14—21]

§ 1. *The complexity of the evidence*

THE study of Christ's miracles of feeding is complicated by Jewish peculiarities not only of thought but also of expression. The former often can be briefly explained; the latter often cannot.

For example, the Feeding of the Five Thousand challenges some kind of comparison (such as we find in the Fourth Gospel) with the giving of the manna in the wilderness¹. Now concerning the latter it is said in Exodus "The people shall go out and gather (lit.) the word of the day in its day²." That is to say, the amount necessary for the day was to be gathered on that same day. It was also to be eaten on that same day. None of it was to be left till next morning³.

According to the texts of our English Versions, the Lord's Prayer, instead of saying "Give us *the bread of the day in its day*," says "Give us *this day our daily bread*," or "Give us *day by day our daily bread*⁴." But these appear to be Christian

¹ Jn vi. 31.

² Exod. xvi. 4. The Heb. for "word" often means "thing" or "matter." LXX omits it, τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν, Vulg. "quae sufficiunt per singulos dies." Aq. inserts αὐτῆς after ἡμέραν.

³ Exod. xvi. 19.

⁴ Mt. vi. 11 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, Lk. xi. 3 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. The pres. imperat. denotes continuous action. A.V. marg. in Lk. has "for the day" instead of "day by day." R.V. marg. in both has "Gr. our bread for the coming day" instead of "our daily bread."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

attempts to render in Greek some Aramaic expression corresponding to the Hebrew of Exodus. For Origen tells us that the Greek for "daily," *epiousios*, did not exist till it came into use in the Lord's Prayer. It is a word of irregular formation and doubtful meaning of which he gives two interpretations, (1) "sufficient for our existence," (2) "fit for future [time]," that is, "fit for the next world¹." Matthew makes the prayer one for a special giving and for a special day, "*Give* (aorist) us *to-day*"; Luke makes it a prayer for continuous giving for every day, "*Give* (pres.) us [*continually*] *day by day*²."

The Jews themselves differed in their interpretations of the passage in Exodus. R. Joshua said that they were to collect from one day to the next as one does from the sabbath-preparation-day to the sabbath itself; R. Eleazar denied this³. In a prayer of this kind, "the bread of the day" might have meanings varying with the time of day when it was uttered and with the time from which one reckoned "the day" as beginning, whether at sunrise as in nature, or at midnight as among the moderns, or at sunset as among the Jews. There are good reasons for concluding that, in the Lord's Prayer, the Greek word that we render "*daily*" meant "*belonging to the day that is now coming on*," which would be specially appropriate to a prayer uttered in the early morning. But the conclusion could not easily be reached without studying the ancient precept in Exodus⁴.

¹ See Origen *De Orat.* § 27.

² Comp. Lk. ix. 23 "take up his cross *daily*," where the parall. Mk viii. 34, Mt. xvi. 24 omit "*daily*."

³ See *Mechilt.* on Exod. xvi. 4.

⁴ In Exodus (xvi. 13, 14) the manna comes with "the morning" and "the dew." See Steph. *Thes.* iii. 1460 for passages shewing that ἡ ἐπιούσα, sometimes without ἡμέρα, means the day that is "coming on" and will arrive in a few hours or minutes, where αὔριον, "the morrow," would sound too formal. Also comp. Prov. xxvii. 1 (Heb.) "Boast not thyself of (lit.) [the] day [that is] to-morrow (LXX τὰ εἰς αὔριον), for thou knowest not what a day (LXX ἡ ἐπιούσα) may bring forth." Here, and here alone, the LXX has

Passing to the Gospels we find that whereas in Mark (followed by Luke) Jesus is described as sending out the

ἡ ἐπιούσα with Heb. equiv. (in Prov. iii. 28 it is corrupt) and the meaning is declared by Rashi to be "*to-day*" ("forsitan *hodie* accidet aliquid mali quod aboleat cogitationes de die crastino"); Walton also renders the Targ. יוֹמָא as "*hodierna dies*." R. Eleazar said (*Mechilt.* on Exod. xvi. 4) "He that hath what he shall eat *to-day*, and saith, 'What shall I eat to-morrow?' is of little faith." From ἐπιούσα there appears to have been constructed an irregular adj. ἐπιούσιος meaning "*belonging to the coming day*." In ἐπιούσα, "*on-coming*," ἐπὶ means "*on*"; but in many compound words it means "*fit*," as in ἐπιτελής, "*fit to please*," and ἐπιούσιος may possibly have conveyed to those who first used it a duplicated meaning, "*fit (or, sufficient), for the on-coming day*."

Ἐπιέναι occurs in LXX elsewhere only in Deut. xxxii. 29 εἰς τὸν ἐπιόντα χρόνον, Heb. "their latter-end (אחריתם)," Aq. εἰς ἐσχάτην αὐτῶν, and 1 Chr. xx. 1 ἐν τῷ ἐπιόντι ἔτει, Heb. "at the time of the return of the year," Vulg. "*post anni circulum*," Syr. "*anno sequenti*," A.V. "*after the year was expired*."

These variations may be illustrated from Jas. ii. 15 τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς, R.V. "*of daily food*," on which Field says "More correctly, '*of the day's supply of food*,' as distinguished from τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν τροφῆς." These two renderings, in effect, correspond to Matthew's and Luke's renderings of the petition for bread in the Lord's Prayer. And it is probable that the original Aramaic of that petition is best represented by Matthew, and is based on the precept about the manna "*the word of the day in its day*," that is, "*the day's supply in the same day*."

Field (on Jas. ii. 15) quotes from Menander a line contrasting the life that is ἐφήμερος, i.e. "*dependent on the day's supply*," with the life that has περισσία, i.e. "*superabundance*." From this it follows that ἐπιούσιος, when meaning ἐφήμερος, might suggest a popular contrast with περισσός, so that, as the latter implied "*above sufficiency*," the former might mean "*fit for sufficiency*."

Some confusion of this kind might be facilitated by the Hebraized use of οὐσία to mean (Levy i. 43 b) "*property*" in various senses.

But while attempting to do justice to minor causes of this variety of interpretation, we must not be diverted by them from keeping in view the main and almost sufficient cause, namely, that Christ's precept originally referred to the saying in the Law, "*the word of the day in its day*"; and the same ambiguity that varied the interpretation of the clause in the Law has also varied its interpretation in the Gospel.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Apostles with the precept "take no bread," Matthew omits the prohibition, and the Didaché limits it ("no bread except [to suffice] till a lodging is found for the night")¹. The only other Marcan instance of "bread" in words of Christ is in the saying "It is not fit to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs²." Reasons have been given for thinking that these words may have belonged, in the original tradition, to the disciples, and that they have been assigned to Jesus by error³. But in any case they are metaphorical and do not clearly shew what is beneath the metaphor⁴.

We may fairly say that we do not find in Mark a single instance where Jesus is described as inculcating a doctrine of Bread. And yet we know, not only from the Lord's Prayer, but also from other passages in Matthew and Luke, as well as from copious discourses in John, that such a doctrine must have existed. Mark seems to hint at some hidden truth or mystery when he says concerning the disciples, shortly after the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Walking on the Waters, "For they understood not in the matter of the loaves, but their heart had been hardened (*or*, made callous⁵)." But he does not tell us what the mystery was.

¹ These passages will be found discussed in Section IV of *The Fourfold Gospel* under Mk vi. 8. Here they are mentioned merely to shew the necessity of discussing verbal detail in Mark.

² Mk vii. 27. This statement refers only to ἄνθρωποι sing. Mk viii. 17 has the pl., and the literal rendering is "ye have not loaves."

³ See *Son* 3353 (iv) a foll.

⁴ The woman's desire was that Jesus should heal her daughter. How this healing could "take the bread of the children" away from the children is not clear, unless the meaning was that Christ's energy was limited, and that, if part of it were bestowed on Syrophenicians, less would remain for Jews. More probably "take and cast" is rhetorically used for "cast," i.e. give it to the dogs as well. This is not the sort of saying that one would assign to Jesus even as a beneficent trial of the woman's faith.

⁵ Mk vi. 52 οὐ γὰρ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄνθρωποις, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη. On πώρωσις, "callousness," see *Proclamation* p. 362 foll.

These considerations should prepare us for a more than usually patient and laborious investigation of Mark's words and phrases in connection with Christ's feeding of the multitudes, while we attempt to ascertain what was the nature of this "callousness of the heart" and what was the nature of the truth "in the matter of the loaves," which truth, in consequence of the "callousness," the disciples "understood not¹."

There will be the usual temptation to explain everything from one cause. And the cause to which many facts appear to point will be found to be poetic metaphor. But there is also the possibility of error arising from antedating post-resurrectional acts and words of Christ². And we shall have to remember that even in pre-Christian days there was already established the homely but sacred meal connected with the *Kiddûsh*, or Sanctification of the Sabbath³. It may be taken as certain that Jesus, in some form, celebrated the *Kiddûsh* on many occasions with His disciples; and it is probable that on some occasions He extended it to the sanctification of other days, and admitted strangers to the meal. Such celebrations, when related in the language of poetic metaphor—and with allusions to such admissions of thousands at a time into the Church as are described in the Acts of the Apostles—might account for much that could not be explained as the result of metaphor alone.

¹ I dismiss, as unworthy of consideration, the notion that it meant that the disciples ought to have learned from the multiplication of the loaves that Jesus could do whatever He liked, and therefore that they were culpably foolish and faithless in being astonished that He could walk upon water.

² See "Post-resurrectional" in Indices of *Son* and *Proclamation*, and see *Proclam.* pp. 1, 56-7 concerning a miraculous draught of fishes, placed by Luke before, but by John after, Christ's resurrection.

³ On the *Kiddûsh*, see *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (Oesterley and Box) p. 346 foll.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

There are no less than seven accounts of miraculous feeding in the Gospels:—(1) the Feeding of the Five Thousand, related by four evangelists, (2) that of the Four Thousand, related by two, (3) that of the seven disciples (after Christ's resurrection) related by one. Mark (followed by Matthew) besides giving two of these accounts, adds a comment¹. He represents Jesus as referring to two of the miracles thus: "When I brake the five loaves among the five thousand, how many baskets (*cophinoi*) full of broken pieces took ye up? . . . And when the seven among the four thousand, how many full baskets (*sphurides*) of broken pieces took ye up?" Here Jesus is described as distinguishing, not only the two actions and the numbers affected by them, but even the two kinds of "baskets" used on the two occasions.

Philo, in his treatise on the Feast of the Baskets—meaning the baskets of the firstfruits mentioned in Deuteronomy—says that it extended over about half the year, being "at two seasons³." He appears to mean the "season" of the corn harvest (including the barley harvest which came first in late spring) and the "season" of "fruits," strictly so called, which extended to the autumn. The Hebrew for the "basket" mentioned in Deuteronomy is different from that used by

¹ Mk vi. 29—44, after describing (*a*) what immediately followed the death of John the Baptist, describes (*b*) the Feeding of the Five Thousand; Mk viii. 1—9 describes (*c*) the Feeding of the Four Thousand; Mk viii. 14—21 describes (*d*) Jesus as reproaching the disciples for not learning what they ought to have learned from these two actions. These Marcan passages, with their parallels, will be found below, (*a*) p. 14, (*b*) pp. 67, 81, 95, 113, 134, 146, (*c*) pp. 61, 67, 81, 95, 113, 134, 146, (*d*) pp. 8—9.

² Mk viii. 19—20, Mt. xvi. 9—10, omitted by Luke.

³ See Philo ii. 298 foll. *De Fest. Coph.* § 3 where he says that the song of the baskets (*καρτάλλων*) is sung *δυσὶ καιροῖς ὁλοκλήρῳ μέρει ἡμίσει τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ*. He is referring to Deut. xxvi. 2—4 *καὶ ἐμβαλεῖς εἰς κάρταλλον...λήψεται ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸν κάρταλλον*. The LXX omits "all" in "all the fruits of the land," but Philo seems to assume that its inclusion is implied.

Jeremiah, speaking of the vintage, "as a grape-gatherer into the *baskets*¹." This suggests that something more than a mere literal difference between two kinds of "*baskets*" may be intended in the two Marcan narratives of feeding—possibly some allusion to the firstfruits of the cornfields and to those of the vineyards and orchards, taken metaphorically as applicable to the ingathering of converts into the Church of Christ.

§ 2. *Traces of metaphor underlying the narratives about the "baskets"*

The last-quoted words of Jesus about the two kinds of "baskets" follow a warning in Mark (and a similar one in Matthew) addressed by Jesus to the disciples, "And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod." This the disciples take literally, saying "We have no loaves." Jesus rebukes them for their literalism, reminding them of the *cophinoi* and the *sphurides* and saying "Do ye not yet understand?" In Mark the connection is obscure. But it is made clearer by Matthew, who represents Jesus as saying "How is it that ye do not perceive that I spake *not to you concerning loaves? But beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.*" Afterwards Matthew adds "Then understood they how that he bade them *not beware of the leaven of loaves, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees.*"

This, though clear, leads us to think of metaphorical loaves as well as metaphorical leaven. If the "leaven" is the formal teaching by which the Pharisees vitiated the Law, then it would seem that the "loaves," metaphorically regarded, are the Law itself. In that case, might not the "five loaves" be the five books of the Law "broken up" and explained to the multitude, piece by piece?

¹ Jer. vi. 9, so R.V. txt, Targ., LXX, Rashi, and Jerome. In Deut. xxvi. 3, Jer. Targ. has (Etheridge) "baskets, hampers, and paper cases."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

This will be considered later on. Meanwhile we must add that there is a difficulty in the mention of a perplexity about "leaven" at a time of the year when, according to Synoptic chronology, no question of leavened or unleavened bread could arise. The Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread were not then at hand. Why should the disciples suppose that their Master warned them against literal "leaven," at a season when literal leaven was quite lawful? It is not surprising that Luke omits all the Mark-Matthew tradition about "loaves." He retains merely a warning against "leaven" as given below¹.

¹ In the parallel passages printed below, and for the most part in others printed in footnotes, R.V. text is followed (with a very few occasional deviations indicated by brackets) as being convenient for rapid reference enabling the reader to take a broad view of the subject under consideration. But in the detailed study of the Greek text, R.V. text is frequently departed from.

Mk viii. 14—21 (R.V.)

(14) And they forgot to take bread (*lit.* loaves); and they had not in the boat with them more than one loaf.

(15) And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod.

(16) And they reasoned one with another, saying, We have no bread (*lit.* loaves).

(17) And Jesus perceiving it saith unto them, Why reason ye, because ye have no bread (*lit.* loaves)? do ye not yet perceive, neither understand? have ye your heart hardened?

(18) Having eyes,

Mt. xvi. 5—12 (R.V.)

(5) And the disciples came to the other side and forgot to take bread (*lit.* loaves).

(6) And Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

(7) And they reasoned among themselves, saying, We took no bread (*lit.* loaves).

(8) And Jesus perceiving it said, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have no bread (*lit.* loaves)?

(9) Do ye not yet perceive, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how

Lk. xii. 1 (R.V.)

In the meantime, when the many thousands of the multitude were gathered together, insomuch that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Besides the Lucan omission of all that part of Mark which connects "leaven" with the feeding of the two multitudes, it will be seen below that there is a remarkable lacuna in Matthew. He omits "they had not in the boat with them more than one loaf." The omission is not surprising. Though Mark often deals in picturesque superfluities, few of his details are so apparently superfluous as this—if taken literally. But, if we can regard it as an ancient symbolical tradition, inserted here as if it were literally true, then it may become both intelligible and interesting. Paul speaks of "*one loaf, one body*" in connection with "*the loaf that we break*" in the Christian Eucharist¹. John also describes Jesus, after the Resurrection, as feeding seven disciples on a fish and "*a loaf*"². It seems a reasonable supposition that Mark has here preserved, out of

Mk viii. 14—21 (R.V.)
contd.

see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?

(19) When I brake the five loaves among the five thousand, how many baskets† full of broken pieces took ye up? They say unto him, Twelve.

(20) And when the seven among the four thousand, how many basketfuls† of broken pieces took ye up? And they say unto him, Seven.

(21) And he said unto them, Do ye not yet understand?

Mt. xvi. 5—12 (R.V.)
contd.

many baskets† ye took up?

(10) Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets† ye took up?

(11) How is it that ye do not perceive that I spake not to you concerning bread (*lit.* loaves)? But beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

(12) Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread (*lit.* loaves), but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

Lk. xii. 1 (R.V.)

† N.B. "Baskets," when first mentioned = *cophinoi*, when next mentioned = *sphurides*.

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16—17.

² Jn xxi. 9, 13. On the sing. "loaf," see *Son* 3422 i.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

place, a symbolical tradition of weighty and solemn meaning, of which he has misunderstood the weight and importance. This hypothesis is at all events more probable than to suppose that Mark has preserved, in its place, a literal detail that never had any importance at all. Matthew's rejection of it may then be explained because he believed it to be out of its right place, and so wrongly placed as to give a false impression which he could not correct. If this hypothesis is accepted, the Marcan detail of the "one loaf" may fairly be regarded along with its Johannine counterpart, as an instance of Johannine Intervention, where John has given the right place and the right interpretation to a tradition misplaced and misunderstood by Mark.

Now let us return to Luke's omission of the connection of "leaven"—called by him "the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy"—with the miraculous feeding. Does John fail to intervene? It might be assumed that he does fail since he nowhere mentions either "leaven" or "unleavened." But he mentions "Passover," that is, in effect, the Feast of Unleavened Bread. And, what is more, he speaks of "the Passover of the Jews," and "the Passover, the feast [so called] of the Jews," in such a way as to suggest that he contrasts "the Passover of the Jews" with "the Passover of Christians." This he does repeatedly¹. He does not indeed expressly contrast the material "leaven" cast out by the Pharisees with the spiritual "leaven" that they retained, but he does imply this distinction.

This we shall see if we put ourselves in the position of Christians of the first century. They would certainly apply Pauline language to the Lord's last Passover. "He kept it," they would say, "on the Cross, or rather He was our Passover on the Cross, so that we might *'keep the feast not with old leaven but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth'*"; but the rulers

¹ Jn ii. 13, xi. 55 τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, vi. 4 (W.H.) τὸ πάσχα, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

of the Jews, His murderers, they kept it in what the Apostle Paul called '*the leaven of malice and wickedness*¹.'" Now John, toward the conclusion of his Gospel, expresses the same thought, not indeed in words, but (as often) in dramatic action. His Gospel lays ironical stress on the scrupulousness with which the rulers of the Jews, on the morning of the Crucifixion, at the very time when they were constraining Pilate to destroy Jesus by judicial murder, "entered not into the palace." Their reason was "*that they might not be defiled*, but might eat the passover²." They duly "*ate*" their "*passover*," but it was "the passover of the Jews." They cast out their leaven. But they *were* "*defiled*"—with the leaven of malice and wickedness.

In the light of these later Johannine utterances let us consider whether John perhaps desired to express something more than a mere chronological fact, when he prefixed to his account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand the words "Now *the Passover, the feast of the Jews*, was at hand. Jesus, therefore, lifting up his eyes, and seeing that a great multitude cometh unto him, saith unto Philip, Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat³?" This was immediately after the murder of John the Baptist. Many a Galilaean in those days would regard John as a shepherd of Israel; and Mark tells us that Jesus had compassion on the multitude because they were "as sheep

¹ 1 Cor. v. 8.

² Jn xviii. 28. See also Jn xi. 55 "*Now the passover of the Jews was at hand: and many went up...to purify themselves*," on which Origen says (Lomm. ii. 372) "The multitude did not know how to purify themselves. Wherefore, while fancying that they were offering '*their own Passover*' as a service to God, they were so far from '*purifying themselves*' that they became more accursed than they were before...." Origen says, and quotes passages to shew, that (*ib.* 371) "We must not suppose the Passover of the Lord to be also *the Passover of the Jews*; for the Passover according to the Law [of God] is that of the Lord, but the Passover of those who break the Law (*τῶν παρανόμων*) is *that of the Jews*."

³ Jn vi. 4—5; "bread," *lit.* "loaves."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

without a shepherd¹." The Pharisees, as far as we know, had made no such protest as John the Baptist made against Herod Antipas, nor had they directly or indirectly supported the prophet. They were also plotting the death of Jesus, while professing to be the teachers of the Law, the Word of Life.

Such conduct—combined with a severe enforcement of precepts of purification—was called by Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels "hypocrisy." It was, in effect, "the leaven of malice and wickedness." The Law, as taught by such teachers, was a false parody of "bread." In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus, before the Feeding of the Five Thousand, says, "Whence shall we buy *loaves* that these may eat?" and, later on, in terms of reproach or warning, "Ye ate of the *loaves* and were satisfied²." But these are the only Johannine passages where Jesus uses the plural "loaves." A little later He uses the singular, which He frequently repeats, "My Father giveth you *the true bread* out of heaven³." It is John's custom to dwell on positives rather than negatives, and on truths rather than falsehoods. In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus warns His disciples negatively against "the leaven of the Pharisees" (Luke adding "which is hypocrisy"). This is the false leaven, and implies the false bread. In John, a similar warning to the multitude is included in His positive doctrine concerning "the true bread." And the words "Whence shall we buy loaves?" addressed to Philip, may convey the same warning to the disciples, a warning against those many kinds of false foods which one buys at the cost of spiritual health and life, whereas the true bread, the living bread, is bought "without money and without price⁴," coming as a gift to those who are taught by the Giver of all Good to give themselves to Him even as He gives Himself to them.

¹ Mk vi. 34. Luke (ix. 11 foll.) omits this. Matthew (xiv. 14 foll.) omits it here, but places it earlier (ix. 36).

² Jn vi. 5, 26.

³ Jn vi. 32.

⁴ Is. lv. 1, see below, p. 70.

As regards the word "buy," in connection with food or bread, we may note here that the Synoptists use it nowhere except in the Feeding of the Five Thousand¹. There all the Evangelists have it, but with this important difference, that while the Three ascribe it in various forms ("are we to buy," "that they may buy") to the disciples, the Fourth ascribes it to Jesus, associating Himself with the disciples—"Whence are we to buy loaves?" Mark, alone of the Synoptists, has "buy loaves." It is highly probable that this Johannine repetition of the Marcan "buy loaves" in what seems² an entirely different context is deliberate. The probability is increased by the fact that, in the same context, John agrees with Mark, against Matthew and Luke, in mentioning "two hundred pennyworth of loaves," as uttered by a disciple or disciples. These two details, even if they stood alone, would suffice to prove that John had in view Marcan traditions. But they do not stand alone. They are parts of a web of traditions, indicating an unusual abundance of complex evidence, bearing on the Rule of Johannine Intervention, and, ultimately, on the historical fact at the bottom of all these narratives.

¹ Ἀγοράζω occurs in Mk vi. 36 with τί φάγωσιν and ib. 37 with ἄπρως, in Mt. xiv. 15, Lk. ix. 13 with βρώματα. It occurs also in Jn iv. 8 with τροφάς and vi. 5 with ἄπρως.

² "Seems," because it is conceivable that John does not reject, but supplements, the Synoptic traditions about buying. Perhaps he regards Jesus as first overhearing, and then receiving, complaints from His disciples ("How are we to buy?"). These He repeats in a kindly "tempting" of Philip: "Yes, truly, how are we to buy?"

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 3. *The immediate sequel of John the Baptist's death*¹

According to Matthew, the Baptist's disciples, after burying their Master, came and "*brought word*" of his death to Jesus,

¹ Mk vi. 29—34 (R.V.)

(29) And when his disciples heard [thereof], they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.

(30) And the apostles gather themselves together unto Jesus; and they told him all things, whatsoever they had done, and whatsoever they had taught.

(31) And he saith unto them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while. For there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat.

(32) And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart.

(33) And [the people] saw them going, and many knew [them], and they ran there together on foot (*or*, by land) from all the cities, and outwent them.

(34) And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them,

Mt. xiv. 12—14 (R.V.)

(12) And his disciples came, and took up the corpse, and buried him; and they went and told Jesus.

(13) Now when Jesus heard [it], he withdrew from thence in a boat, to a desert place apart: and when the multitudes heard [thereof], they followed him on foot (*or*, by land) from the cities.

(14) And he came forth, and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, and healed their sick.

Comp. Mt. ix. 36

But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion for them, because they were dis-

Lk. ix. 10—11 (R.V.)

(10) And the apostles, when they were returned, declared unto him what things they had done. And he took them, and withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida.

(11) But the multitudes perceiving it followed him: and he welcomed them, and spake to them of the kingdom of God, and them that had need of healing he healed.

who, on "hearing [of it]," withdrew into a desert place. But according to Mark, the Baptist's disciples, "on hearing [of it]," buried him; and the apostles gathered to Jesus and "*brought word*" to Him of all that they had done and taught. Matthew's use of "*bring word*" accords better than Mark's with the usage of N.T. and of Greek in general. The Greek verb "*bring word*," literally, "*bring-message-from*," implies etymologically, and for the most part practically, bringing word from a certain person or place about what the bringers have heard (as a message) from that person, or have seen or heard at that place. It does not often mean simply describe what the describers have themselves done. In that sense, "*declare*" or "*relate*" would be a better word than "*bring word*." Luke, who follows Mark in inserting a coming of "the apostles" to Jesus, says that they "*declared*" to Him "all that they had done¹."

The text of Mark is liable to suspicion. We do not know whether this is the first or the second instance in which he uses the word "apostles²." If it is the first, it comes here with

Mk vi. 29—34 (R.V.)	Mt. xiv. 12—14 (R.V.)	Lk. ix. 10—11 (R.V.)
<i>contd.</i>	<i>contd.</i>	

because they were as sheep not having a shepherd : and he began to teach them many things.	tressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd.
--	--

Jn vi. 1—5 a (R.V.). (1) After these things Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee, which is [the sea] of Tiberias. (2) And a great multitude followed him, because they beheld the signs which he did on them that were sick. (3) And Jesus went up into the mountain, and there he sat with his disciples. (4) Now the passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand. (5) Jesus therefore lifting up his eyes, and seeing that a great multitude cometh unto him,...

¹ Mk vi. 30 (and Mt. xiv. 12) "*brought word* (ἀπήγγειλαν)," Lk. ix. 10 "*declared* (δηγγήσαντο)." Luke omits "all that they had taught."

² See *Proclamation* p. 394 on Mk iii. 14 (R.V. marg. "some anc. auth. add *whom also he named apostles*").

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

extreme abruptness; and, even if it is the second and refers to those mentioned by Mark above, "whom also he [*i.e.* Jesus] named apostles," we should expect Mark to say, not that "they gather themselves together" to Jesus, but that "they returned" —which Luke actually says¹. In his parallel to Mark's expression "and *when* his disciples *heard thereof*," Matthew omits the "hearing²," which Mark may have added (as LXX often adds it) to imply "consequently³." But Matthew also omits all mention of the "apostles." This seems best explained from an original and ambiguous "they." This Matthew may have taken as meaning *the persons last mentioned*, namely, the disciples of the Baptist, but Mark as *the persons last mentioned before the digression concerning the death of the Baptist*, namely, the Twelve Apostles. Luke's omission of the Marcan phrase "whatsoever things they had taught" can be best explained by supposing it to be a Marcan amplification for clearness, the original being simply "they brought word of *everything*." This, if "they" were the disciples of the Baptist, would mean "they brought word of the whole story of the Baptist's death⁴." But Mark took it

¹ Mk vi. 30 συνάγονται, Lk. ix. 10 ὑποστρέψαντες. Συνάγω, which occurs five times in Mark, is used thrice of multitudes, and once (Mk vii. 1) of Pharisees and scribes, "gathering together" to Jesus. It is not the word we should expect for the return of so small a number as twelve persons, unless it was intended to suggest that they had been sent in different directions (comp. Lk. ix. 6 "everywhere").

² Mk vi. 29 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦλθαν καὶ ἤραν..., Mt. xiv. 12 καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤραν.... Matthew applies "hearing" to Jesus in the next verse, Mt. xiv. 13 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. See next note.

³ Comp. Josh. ix. 11, 2 K. ix. 13, Esth. iv. 4, Job i. 20 (A), where Heb. has "and [consequently]," and LXX (or v.r.) inserts ἀκούσας.

⁴ SS has "they declared to him all that *he did* and *he taught*." Prof. Burkitt says that this is "probably a mere error" of SS, the pronunciation for this being the same as that for "they did and taught." If the scribe of SS attached any meaning to the text it would seem to be this, "the disciples of John recounted to Jesus

as referring to the Twelve. The notion that the Apostles at this critical and busy moment found leisure to bring word to Jesus about "*whatsoever things* they had taught," as well as "*whatsoever things* they had done," is antecedently improbable—at least in this hyperbolical form—and the rejection of it by Luke increases the improbability.

Since these details refer mainly to the Baptist, we cannot expect the Fourth Gospel to intervene although Luke deviates from, or omits, what is in Mark¹.

§ 4. "*And he saith unto them, Come ye...and rest a little,*"
in Mark²

Matthew and Luke omit these words. But, whereas Luke nowhere has any words of Jesus resembling them, Matthew has an invitation at least so far resembling Mark's that it contains similar words for "come" and "rest": "*Come unto me...and I will give-you-rest...ye shall find rest for your souls*³." The context in Matthew is a paradox, namely, that by taking on oneself a new "yoke," one may find "rest" from a heavy "burden." Ben Sira writes to the same effect about "discipline" or "instruction," saying "Incline thy shoulder and carry her, and loathe not her cords..., for afterward thou shalt find her *rest*⁴." A different aspect of "*rest*," namely, rest from wanderings, is presented by Jeremiah, "Ask for the

all their Master's last actions and utterances," including those mentioned in Mk vi. 20.

¹ See *Beginning* pp. 66, 68—71, "Non-intervention in matters affecting John the Baptist."

² Mk vi. 31 Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὀλίγον. SS has here "Come, let us go to the wilderness...", but in vi. 32, "they went to a desert place." The "desert place" will be discussed in a later section.

³ Mt. xi. 28—9 Δεῦτε πρὸς με πάντες...καγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς...ἐύρησθε ἀνάπανσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν. The words δεῦτε and ἀναπαύω are common to Mark and Matthew.

⁴ Sir. vi. 28 (ed. Schechter and Taylor), "rest," ἀνάπανσιν, מנוח.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

old paths...and walk therein, and ye shall find *rest*, i.e. *repose*, for your souls¹." Again another aspect is presented where Isaiah says "This is the *rest*, give ye *rest* to him that is weary." There "weary" corresponds to a Hebrew word meaning faintness caused by hunger, or by thirst, or by wandering, and the LXX has "this is the rest for *him that is hungry*²." The Greek words used by Mark and Matthew for "rest" may also mean "refresh" in general, and "refresh with food" in particular. But in the latter sense, "with food" would have to be inserted. Mark does not insert it, and therefore we have no right to assume that he means "refresh yourselves a little [with food]." That interpretation however—besides being suggested by Mark's following words, "for those that were coming and those that were going were many, and *they* (i.e. *the disciples*) *had no leisure so much as to eat*"—appears to be favoured by Origen, who, after quoting Mark and Luke (about the "rows" or "companies" of the Five Thousand), speaks of "*those who were about to refresh-themselves on the nourishment of Jesus*³."

If Mark and Matthew took different views of the "rest," or "refreshment," to which Jesus invited His disciples, we can understand why Luke omitted the invitation. Mark places it immediately after the return of the Apostles from their mission; Matthew places it not long after Jesus had "made an end of

¹ Jerem. vi. 16, מְרִנּוֹעַ, LXX ἀγνισμόν, Aq. [ἀνάψυξιν], Sym. ἡρεμίαν.

² Is. xxviii. 12 τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάπαυμα τῷ πεινῶντι. The word rendered πεινῶν, ἡ'ע=δψάω (5), πεινάω (4), ἐκλύω (3)—for which comp. Mk viii. 3, Mt. xv. 32 in the Feeding of the Four Thousand.

³ Origen *Comm. Matth.* xi. 3 (Lomm. iii. 73) τοὺς ἀναπαυσομένους ἐπὶ ταῖς Ἰησοῦ τροφαῖς. I have not found such an instance in Steph. *Thes.*, nor one parall. to Mt. xi. 28 ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς, but there "from your burdens" may be supplied from what precedes. In Aesch. *fragm.* 178, ἀναπαύει, with καματὸν ἵππων, prob. does not mean (as L.S.) "refresh," but (as Steph. *Thes.*) "pausare," "make to cease."

commanding his twelve disciples¹." Luke in a quasi-parallel passage mentions the return of the Seventy to Jesus with a report about their mission; but he appends no invitation—only a promise, such as the Mark-Appendix places after Christ's resurrection². Later on, in his Gospel, Luke represents Jesus as eating *in the presence of* His disciples, and later still, in the Acts—according to an ancient interpretation of a very difficult passage—as "*eating with them*"; but even there, no invitation on the part of Jesus to the disciples is mentioned in the context³.

¹ Mt. xi. 1. Mt. xi. 2—24 contains digressions about John the Baptist, Chorazin and Bethsaida. Then *ib.* 25—7 contains an acknowledgment of the Father's purpose to reveal His mysteries to "babes." Then follows (xi. 28—30) the promise of "rest" to the weary.

² Luke, after the woe pronounced (x. 13 foll.) on Chorazin and Bethsaida, and the return of the Seventy, represents Jesus as saying (x. 19) "I have given you authority...and nothing shall in any wise hurt you" (comp. Mk [xvi. 18] a promise made after Christ's resurrection).

³ Acts i. 4 συναλιζόμενος, R.V. and A.V. txt "being assembled together with them," marg. "eating (A.V. + together) with them." See *Notes* 2892—5, to which should be added references to the "covenant of salt" in Numb. xviii. 19 (comp. Lev. ii. 13) and to the prominence given by Philo (ii. 477, 483—4) to "salt (*ἅλς*)" in his description of the meals taken by the Essenes in common. Aquila used the word συναλίζομαι to mean "take a friendly meal with" in Ps. cxli. 4 "let me not *eat of* their dainties." There LXX has συνδουάζω, *i.e.* "make one out of two," "be in close companionship" (comp. 1 S. xxvi. 19 "cleave to," Sym. συνδυνάεσθαι). Aquila's instance does not conclusively shew whether he regarded συναλίζομαι as derived (1) from ἀλίζω "collect [a crowd into a small space]" or (2) from ἀλίζομαι "be salted," *i.e.* "fed on salt"—salt being, both for Greeks and for Jews, the symbol of close, friendly, and festive intercourse (Steph. *Thes.* i. 1580 ἅλς "convictus et communio et sodalitatis necessitudo"). Against (1), there is the fact that ἀλίζω appears to be never used with a personal object in the singular, but always of a crowd, army, etc. This important word will come before us again when we discuss the Marcan (ix. 49) doctrine of being "salted with fire" (which Matthew and Luke omit).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

This passage in the Acts brings before us, as a possibility worth considering, the hypothesis that Mark, among a number of detached traditions about Eucharistic feeding which he has included in his narrative of the Five Thousand, may have antedated a tradition (about Jesus as inviting His disciples to a sacred meal) which may have been placed after the Resurrection by other Evangelists, and, in particular, by John. In any case, since "Come and rest" is a saying of Jesus mentioned by Mark and omitted by Luke, we are bound to look for something like it in John. And something like it—much more like it than appears at first sight—occurs in the Johannine account of the post-resurrectional feeding of the seven disciples on the one loaf, where Jesus is represented in our Revised Version as saying to the disciples, "Come, break your fast¹."

Instead of "break your fast," some such phrase as "take-your-morning-meal" would have been a better rendering of the verb *aristân*. It is nowhere used in N.T. except (twice) in this Johannine passage, and in one passage of Luke, where a Pharisee invites Jesus to a morning meal². There, the texts of our English Versions render it "dine." But the Greek word never means "dine." It is constantly distinguished from "dine," and contrasted with "dine³."

Returning to John, and rendering the invitation literally,

¹ Jn xxi. 12 δεῦτε, ἀριστήσατε. On δεῦτε, "Come!" never used by Luke, but used by Mk-Mt. in the "invitation" now under consideration (and elsewhere), see *Proclam.* pp. 48—9.

² Lk. xi. 37 ἀριστήσῃ. R.V. text "dine," marg. "Gr. breakfast." The context speaks of the washing of hands. Possibly, among the common people, though not among the Pharisees, the rule was not so strictly observed before "breakfast" as before the later meal.

³ See Steph. *Thes.* It can no more mean "dine" than our "breakfasted" could mean "dined." Luke uses the words "*dine*" and "*dinner*" (δειπνεῖν, δείπνον) about six or seven times, and the verb "to breakfast" only here. In one passage (xiv. 12) "a breakfast or a dinner," he distinguishes the two.

"[Come] *hither! Take-your-morning-meal!*" we perceive that it accords not only with the literal time—the dawn that brought success to the fishermen after the laborious night of failure—but also with the metaphorical or spiritual time, the dawn that was to bring success to the apostolic fishermen casting the net of the Gospel. The meal was their "morning-meal" preparing them to carry forth the Gospel to the world¹. It appears to correspond both literally and spiritually to the Marcan tradition "Come ye... and rest," omitted by Luke, of which perhaps a version is given by Matthew. As in Mark, so in John, the invitation precedes a meal on bread and fish; but, as in Matthew, the "rest" or "refreshment" is not of the body but of the spirit. Matthew expresses it by "Take my yoke upon you" and "Learn from me"; John expresses it by the words addressed to Peter, and through Peter to the whole assembly of Christians, commanding each in his appointed way to carry the cross, and to serve Christ by serving those for whom Christ died: "Feed my sheep," and "Follow thou me"².

§ 5. "*Come ye, [by] yourselves, apart, into a desert place,*"
in Mark³

The words "into a desert place" appear to imply, not a desert place meaning a dry and barren waste, but simply "a lonely, quiet, or retired, place." But they are omitted (with the rest of the sentence) by Matthew and Luke, perhaps as being liable to misunderstanding. The words "by yourselves" and "apart" go some way to make the meaning clear, but not quite far enough. The meaning seems to be that in

¹ In canonical LXX, ἀριστῶν occurs only twice as representing Hebrew correctly, (a) Gen. xliii. 25 Heb. "eat bread," (b) 1 K. xiii. 7 Heb. "support [thyself with food]," R.V. and A.V. "refresh thyself," Heb. סעד and sim. in Targum. The Clementine Heb. rendering of Jn xxi. 12 ἀριστῶσαι is סעד.

² Mt. xi. 28—9, Jn xxi. 15—22.

³ Mk vi. 31.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the general excitement and consternation consequent on the murder of John the Baptist, Jesus perceived that it would be good for the disciples to be alone with Him for a while. To be alone with Him would not be to be really "alone," or "desolate," or "abandoned in a wilderness." Being with the Son, they would be with the Father. Epictetus has a discourse entitled "What is *desertedness* (or, a *desert* (erēmia)) and what kind of person is *deserted* (erēmos)?" It begins thus: "*Desertedness* is a kind of unbefriended state. For he that is *alone* is not necessarily *deserted*, as also he that is in a crowd is not necessarily *undeserted*¹."

That John recognised this truth is shewn later on when he represents Jesus as saying "Ye shall leave me alone; and [yet] I am not alone, because the Father is with me²." He could not indeed represent Jesus as saying to the seven disciples for whom He has prepared the fish and the loaf "Come ye, by yourselves, apart, into a quiet place"—for they were in a quiet place already. But he does succeed in giving us the impression that, before the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Jesus had invited the disciples to accompany Him away from the multitude into a place of quiet. In the description of the man seeking the one sheep that has strayed, where Matthew has "*the mountains*," Luke has "*the desert*." So here, John does not call the place of retirement "*a desert place*" but "*the mountain*," thus: "And a great multitude followed him... and Jesus went up into *the mountain*, and there he sat with his disciples³."

In this way John, in effect, reproduces the Marcan "desert place," but without the notion of desertedness. By "sat with

¹ Epictet. iii. 13. 1.

² Jn xvi. 32.

³ Jn vi. 2—3, comp. Mt. xviii. 12 "the mountains," Lk. xv. 4 "the desert." The "loneliness" of "the mountain" comes before us afterwards (Jn vi. 15) "Jesus withdrew again into the mountain *himself alone*."

his disciples" he implies that Jesus was not only with them but also was with them in quiet converse. As regards the term "desert place" or "wilderness" used by all the Synoptists in their narratives of feeding¹, it is noteworthy that John does not use any form of it in the narrative itself. But afterwards, in the subsequent comment of the Jews, and in Christ's reply, he twice has "ate the manna *in the wilderness*," that is, *in the wilderness of Sinai*. The Jews seem to say this with unmixed satisfaction, "*our fathers ate.*" Jesus adds a note of warning, "*your fathers ate...and died*²."

Before passing from the words of Jesus ("come ye...into a *desert place*") we must note that the Syriac Versions have, not "*a desert place*," but "*the wilderness*," *midbar*³. This has quite a different meaning. *Midbar* might be applied to a wilderness or open country near any town or district, named in the context; but where no such place is named it always means (in the Bible) the wilderness of Sinai, as, for example, where the Lord bids Moses say to Pharaoh "Let us go...three days' journey into *the wilderness* that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God⁴." Among the reasons why Matthew and Luke omit these words, one may have been a doubt whether they were correctly used. In early poetic accounts of Christ's miracles of feeding, the language of Scripture about the manna in the Midbar of Sinai might be applied to the Christian "table in the wilderness" in expressions sometimes not strictly correct if taken literally. These might naturally be rejected by later Evangelists.

¹ Mk vi. 35, Mt. xiv. 15 (sim. Lk. ix. 12) ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, Mk viii. 4, Mt. xv. 33 ἐρημία.

² Jn vi. 31, 49.

³ Mk vi. 31 (SS) "let us go into *the wilderness* (midbar),' but vi. 32 "they went to a *desert place*" and vi. 35 "the *place* is *desert*."

⁴ Exod. iii. 18, rep. viii. 27. It is worth noting here that a mention of "three days" (which will be discussed later on, § 17) occurs at the beginning of the Feeding of the Four Thousand.

§ 6. *The concourse of "many," in Mark*

Mark four times uses the word "many" here, thrice in connection with the concourse of "many" or "the great [lit. *much*] multitude," and once about the "many [things]" that Jesus began to teach them¹. There are several variations in the MSS and Versions. A specimen of these is given below from the Syro-Sinaitic², which avoids one or two difficult questions raised by the received text.

It is not difficult perhaps to realise that the disciples might feel not only overcrowded by people continually coming to Jesus, but also harassed by people continually going away. But it is difficult to believe that the multitude, which (according to Matthew) included women and children, "outwent" the boat that contained Jesus—the multitude going round the lake, a distance of about ten miles, and the boat going across the lake, a distance of about four³.

¹ Mk vi. 31—4 "For those that were coming and those that were going (ὑπάγοντες) were many...and many saw (εἶδαν) them (αὐτοὺς) going (ὑπάγοντας) and recognised (ἐγνώσαν, marg. ἐπέγνώσαν) [them] (or, and they [*i.e.* people] saw them going, and many recognised [them]); and on foot from all the cities they ran-together there and outwent them (συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς). And having come forth [from the boat] he saw a great (πολὴν) multitude...and he began to teach them many [things] (πολλά)." *See*

² Mk vi. 31 foll. (SS) "Many were going and coming unto him... and many saw them and recognised them and went by land after him from all the cities. And when they came and he saw a great multitude...and he had begun to teach them." SS alters "those coming and those going" into "going and coming unto him," thus emphasizing the arrivals rather than the departures, or perhaps using "going and" pleonastically (as it is often used in English); it substitutes "went after him" for "ran-together"; it omits "outwent them"; it substitutes "they came and he saw" for "he came forth [from the vessel] and saw."

This important version had not been discovered when W.H. discussed the variations of Mk vi. 33 in W.H. Intr. p. 95 foll.

³ Prof. Swete says *ad loc.* "Across the Lake from Tell Hum or Khan Minyeh is scarcely more than four miles; by land the distance

Luke seems to imply, by omitting all these Marcan details, that they seemed to him either unimportant, or difficult, or both, and that the one important fact was that "the multitudes followed" Jesus—how "they followed" being a matter of detail that might be neglected. Perhaps Luke, in this respect, is imitating Matthew, who also accepts "the multitudes followed" as a convenient summary of Mark's diffuse statements¹. But Luke deviates from Matthew as well as from Mark by omitting the words "And, having gone forth [from the boat] he saw a great multitude²." They do not seem very important, and, even if John had nothing whatever corresponding to them, though we should have to confess that the law of Johannine Intervention failed here, it would not seem a very serious failure. But John has in the context something that appears to correspond to them, only modified by a suggestion of symbolism, as follows: "After these things Jesus went away beyond the sea of Galilee [the sea] of Tiberias. Now a great multitude was following him, because they were [constantly] seeing the signs that he was doing on the sick. But Jesus went up to the mountain, and there sat with his disciples. Now the passover was near—the feast of the Jews

to the upper part of Batihah could hardly be above ten (Sanday, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 120) unless they went by road and crossed the Jordan by the bridge." He adds "If there was little wind, it would be easy to get to the place before a sailing boat." But if there was so "little wind" that they could not cover "more than four miles" while a crowd including women and children covered "ten," would they not have at once used their oars, which Mark (vi. 48) and John (vi. 19) describe them as using on their return?

¹ Mt. xiv. 13 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ, Lk. ix. 11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γνόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Mark does not use ἀκολουθέω here. His view is that the multitude went round the lake before Jesus so as to meet Him when He landed—which would not naturally be described as "following."

² Mk vi. 34, Mt. xiv. 14 (identical in order as well as in words) καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

[so called]. Jesus therefore, *lifting up his eyes and beholding that a great multitude was coming to him*, saith unto Philip. . .¹."

It will be noted that here, while first accepting the Matthew-Luke prosaic summarizing word, "*followed*," John adds a form of the Mark-Matthew tradition that Jesus "*beheld*" this "*great multitude*." That this is symbolical is indicated by the contextual "*lifting up of the eyes*"—an act thrice attributed to Jesus by John and always as a symbol². It is also attributed thrice in Scripture to Abraham. The first Abrahamic instance is where the Patriarch "*lifted up his eyes*" and beheld the three divine Persons to whom he ministered and gave bread; the second is where he saw the mountain on which he was to offer up his son; the third is where he saw the ram that was to be Isaac's substitute³. It is a commonplace in Jewish tradition that whatever Abraham did in service to God, God has done, or will do, in return, to Abraham's seed. It would therefore be appropriate that before the Feeding of the Five Thousand, who represented the congregation of Israel, the Son of God should "*go up into the mountain*" and "*lift up his eyes*," and "*behold that a great multitude was coming unto him*."

¹ Jn vi. 1—5. This implies that Jesus was on the spot and receiving the multitude (as Lk. ix. 11 "he welcomed them"), not that the multitude was on the spot awaiting Jesus whom they "*outwent*" (as Mk vi. 33). In Mk vi. 33 προῆλθον αὐτοῖς, "*they outwent them*," "*they*" may mean (1) Jesus and the disciples, or (2) the multitude (and "*them*" is similarly ambiguous). The former meaning of "*they*" is the more consistent with the circumstances; taking the short cut across the lake, Jesus and the disciples easily "*outwent*" the multitude. Then, some hours afterwards, Jesus received and welcomed those who persistently followed Him. Mark's use of προέρχομαι with accus. is noteworthy (see Steph. Thes.). In Lk. xxii. 47 it is used of Judas "*going before*" the soldiers as their guide.

² See Joh. Voc. 1608 (quoting Philo) and Joh. Gr. 2616—7 on Jn vi. 3—5. The other instances are xi. 41 (at the tomb of Lazarus), xvii. 1 (before "Father, the hour hath come"). Once Jesus uses the phrase as a precept, iv. 35 "*Lift up your eyes*," i.e. to the harvest in the heavens.

³ Gen. xviii. 2, xxii. 4, 13.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Whatever may have been the historical reality, the Evangelist contemplates it as including a vision. The Son, the Sacrifice, the Bread of Life, who in old days came to Abraham and received Abraham's bread, now "beholds" the children of Abraham coming to Him in need of bread. Visibly, they are five thousand Jews from northern Palestine; but invisibly they are the seed of Abraham as a whole, invited to enter the circle of that large family of nations which was to be blessed with the blessing pronounced on Abraham. As Abraham gave bread to the Son, so the Son gives bread to Abraham's children. And as Abraham offered up Isaac to God, so the Son of God, in the sign of the bread that followed, signified that He Himself was purposing to offer Himself up for Abraham's children in accordance with the will of the Father in heaven.

If this instance stood alone, the hypothesis of Johannine Intervention here would not be a very probable one; but when taken with many other instances of which some few are certain and many others are highly probable, it acquires considerable probability. And this is greatly increased by the drift of Jewish traditions concerning Abraham and his relation to the Messiah. In a Gospel that assigns to Jesus the words "Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad¹," it is obvious that we must expect to find thoughts about Abraham latent under many of the acts and utterances of Him to whom these words are assigned. We may safely assert that the actual words are John's, not Christ's, but we shall not be so safe in making such an assertion about the thoughts.

This proof of intervention is quite irrespective of the correctness of the Marcan or the Johannine tradition. Even if Mark is quite wrong, it will still be true that John, believing Mark to be right in a certain sense, has intervened to shew that sense. What that "sense" might naturally be will be perceived from such a prophecy as that of Amos, "I will send a

¹ Jn viii. 56. See *Joh. Gr.* 2097, 2688—9.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst of water, but of hearing the words of the Lord; and they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east; they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord¹." Jesus Himself seems to allude to this prophecy in the words "Many shall come from the east and the west"—where Luke adds "and from the north and the south"—"and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven²." Also a prophecy of Daniel, interpreted by Irenaeus as referring to Christ, says "Many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased³." This, when combined with the prophecy of Amos, might originate just such traditions as Mark has thrown together about the concourse of "many" to Christ's teaching, and to the banquet that He provided for those who suffered from a "famine" for "hearing the words of the Lord." The hypothesis of such an origin would give a satisfactory explanation of Mark's diffuse traditions and Luke's omissions. "Mark,"

¹ Amos viii. 11—12.

² Mt. viii. 11, Lk. xiii. 29. The occasions on which these parallel sayings were uttered are quite different. Origen, quoting the Gospels, has (*Comm. Rom.* ii. 14, *Lomm.* vi. 148) "*ab oriente et occidente et a quatuor ventis terrae.*" Does this mean "and [indeed, not only from east and west, but also, as Luke says] from the four winds of the world"? The Targum on Amos viii. 12 has "from the sea to the west (מערב) and from the north to the east." *Sabbath* p. 138 b (ed. Goldschmidt) quotes Amos "From sea to sea from east (מזרח) and from west (מערב)" with no note. On Zech. ix. 10 "from sea to sea," the Targ. says "from the sea even to the west," but Kimchi "from the South Sea which is called Red, to the North Sea which is called Ocean." These variations may have influenced Christian traditions about the concourse to Jesus. Some might take "from sea to sea" as "from the sea of Galilee to the Mediterranean," i.e. the parts about Tyre and Sidon. Luke would not interpret "sea" as referring to the sea of Galilee since he always calls it "lake."

³ Dan. xii. 4 LXX *ἔως ἂν ἀπομανῶσιν οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ πλησθῇ ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας.* But Theod. *ἔως διδαχθῶσιν πολλοὶ καὶ πληθυνθῇ ἡ γνώσις* (הדעת) (see *Clue* 7, 90—1), and so Iren. iv. 26. 1 "*quoadusque discant multi et adimpleatur agnitio.*"

we may say, "recorded a historical fact (that is, the Concourse) in the language of poetry based on prophecy—not knowing the nature either of the language or of its basis—and left the old traditions just as they were without making them fit together; Luke omitted them; John penetrated to the old poetical purpose underlying Mark and expressed it in a new symbolism."

In a comment on Mark's narrative of the first concourse to Jesus attention was drawn to the apparent allusiveness of the Marcan "great number," as pointing to expressions in Genesis concerning the seed of Abraham¹. But in that Marcan narrative we may trace also the influence of Amos (variously interpreted) in suggesting the regions of the world from which believers were to draw near to the Messiah². The same influences may be traced in Mark's narrative of a second concourse. The Hebrew use of the somewhat rare verb "*run-to-and-fro*," applied to those hungering and thirsting after truth by Amos, and to "*many*" by Daniel³, may very well explain Mark's perplexing accumulation of verbs of motion, commented on above—"coming and going," "*running together*," and "*outstripping*"—all omitted by Matthew and Luke.

This recognition of Mark's allusiveness, in connection with a prophecy about "*many*," will come before us again when we consider such Marcan words of Jesus as "to give his life a ransom for *many*," and, "this is my blood which...is shed for *many*⁴." Both of these sayings appear to be based on words of Isaiah: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify

¹ *Proclamation* p. 376, quoting Mk iii. 7—8 πολλὸν πληθὺς...πληθὺς πολὺ.

² Amos viii. 12, mentioning the "north," may explain why Mark (*Proclamation* p. 375) followed by Matthew, inserts "Galilee," as representing the "north" (besides being the "Galilee of the Gentiles" mentioned by Isaiah). Luke vi. 17 omits "Galilee."

³ Amos viii. 12, Dan. xii. 4 "*run-to-and-fro*" (Gesen. 1001—2).

⁴ Mk x. 45, xiv. 24 parall. to Mt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28, omitted in parall. Lk. xxii. 27 and *ib.* 20 (see W.H.).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

many...he bare the sin of *many*¹." Both are adopted by the parallel Matthew but omitted by the parallel Luke.

Are we to infer that in both these passages Mark has been induced by the influence of prophecy to attribute to Jesus sayings that He did not really utter, which Luke has consequently omitted? Without anticipating the discussion of these Marcan traditions in their order, we may note here, as to the first of them, that the parallel Luke introduces, as words of Jesus, "he that sitteth at meat" and "he that serveth," and represents Jesus as saying "I am among you as he that serveth²." Now John represents Jesus as actually "serving" while the disciples sit at meat—and serving in such a way as to suggest a picture of the Saviour of the world wiping off the stains of sinful men upon Himself³. This points to a Johannine intervention between Mark and Luke, as if John said: "It is true that Mark has added, to the actual words that Jesus uttered, words that He did not utter. But he added

¹ Is. liii. 11—12. Of רבים, freq. = "*many* [*men*]," Gesen. 913 *a* gives, as the first instance, Exod. xxiii. 2 (*bis*) "Thou shalt not follow *a multitude* (so R.V. and A.V.) to do evil, neither shalt thou speak in a cause to turn aside after *a multitude* (A.V. *many*) to wrest [judgment]," LXX οὐκ ἔσῃ μετὰ πλείονων ἐν κακίᾳ· οὐ προσθήσῃ μετὰ πλήθους ἐκκλίνειν μετὰ πλειονων ὥστε ἐκκλείσαι κρίσιν. On this, Rashi says "Sunt hujus textus expositiones sapientum Israël, sed sermo Scripturae eis non convenit..." But it does not appear to be disputed that the Heb. "*many*," in a suitable context, may mean "*the many*," or "*the majority*."

² Lk. xxii. 27 τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν;...ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμὶ ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.

³ Jn xiii. 4 foll. See *Notes* 2963—4 shewing that Origen (on Jn xiii. 5) quotes Luke xxii. 27 with a reminiscence of Mk x. 45 "He who said 'I came not as the guest but as the attendant'...He Himself puts water in the basin." Origen also (Lomm. ii. 401) connects the Saviour's "wiping off" on Himself the filth from the feet of the disciples with Is. liii. 4 (comp. Mt. viii. 17) "He beareth our infirmities." See *Son* 3276 *a* where the belief is expressed that this representation was not a dramatic fiction, but was based on tradition.

them to explain what Jesus *meant* by 'ministering': Luke, rejecting those additional words, has left the saying of Jesus in such a context as to lead his readers into a misunderstanding of His 'ministering.' It was not waiting at table, handing this dish or that. It might rather be described as a washing of the feet before the repast. And indeed the Saviour did this kind of service for His disciples, wiping off on Himself the defilements that could not but from time to time befall them in the course of their pilgrimage through the impurities of this present world¹."

§ 7. "*They had no leisure so much as to eat,*" in Mark²

It is of course possible that this Marcan tradition meant, from the first, nothing more than this, that the disciples had literally "no leisure" to eat enough for their simple wants; that Mark inserted it in this sense; and that Matthew and Luke omitted it—influenced perhaps in part by the fact that Jesus seemed to have summoned them at an early hour of the morning³, before the time had come for a regular meal—because they thought it hyperbolic. Or Matthew and Luke may have omitted it as being unimportant from a spiritual point of view.

¹ On Gen. xviii. 4 "let a little water be fetched and wash your feet," Rashi says that as the water is fetched by Abraham's "servant" "per aliquem qui mittitur," i.e. *Sheliach*, or *Apostle* (*Proclamation* pp. 391, 395), so God recompenses Abraham's children by a messenger ("legatum"), namely, Moses. But *Gen. i.* ad loc. sees a divine recompense of water proceeding not only from Moses (Numb. xxi. 17) who gives water to drink, but also from God (Is. iv. 4, Ezek. xvi. 9) who Himself purifies Israel with water (sim. more fully in *Numb. i.*, on Numb. vii. 48, Wü. pp. 348—9).

² Mk vi. 31 οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν, D ουδε φαγειν ευκαιρος (i.e. εὐκαίρως) ειχον, a "nec cibum poterant capere," SS (lit.) "and there was not for them place even bread to eat."

³ Mk vi. 30—35 shews that a great deal took place between the summons of Jesus and the advent of evening, so that the summons must have been early.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

But there are so many instances where Mark's apparently unimportant little phrases about certain subjects, and particularly about the Doctrine of Bread, are much more important than they seem, that this phrase invites investigation. Its insertion in an early Gospel would become intelligible if it originally described the disciples as being unable to "eat their bread" at a common meal with such "gladness and singleness of heart¹" as characterized the meals taken by them in company with Jesus. Such meals would partake of the nature of a religious service. The omission of the phrase by Matthew and Luke would, by itself, oblige us to discuss it; and the fact that it refers to bread (not indeed here mentioned but certainly implied by the word "eat") makes the discussion all the more necessary.

The Marcan verb "*have-leisure*," literally "*have-good-season*," occurs nowhere else in the Gospels nor in LXX. Codex D substitutes a phrase with a corresponding adverb meaning "*in-good-season*." This adverb occurs in Ben Sira "Be not thou hindered from paying a vow *in-good-season*²"; and the corresponding adjective occurs in the Psalms "These wait upon thee that thou mayest give them their meat *in-due-season*³." These passages vaguely suggest that in the beginnings of the Christian Church forms of the word might be associated by some with the Eucharist, or with Christ's "breaking of bread" before the Eucharist was formally instituted. But the verb, though proscribed by the Grammarians as a barbarous equivalent of the legitimate phrase "have leisure⁴," is used by Luke (in the

¹ Acts ii. 46 "breaking bread at home they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart."

² Sir. xviii. 22 μή ἐμποδισθῆς τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι εὐχὴν εὐκαίρως. It occurs nowhere else in LXX.

³ Ps. civ. 27 τὴν τροφὴν αὐτοῖς εὐκαιρον (v. γ. εἰς καιρον, ἐν ευκαιρια, εἰς ευκαιρον). This is the only instance in canon. LXX, but in 2 and 3 Macc. εὐκαιρος occurs five times.

⁴ "Have leisure," σχολὴν ἄγω, or σχολάζω. See Steph. *Thes.*

Acts) concerning the Athenians: "Now all the Athenians and the strangers sojourning there (lit.) *were-wont-to-have-good-season* for nothing else except to say or hear something of more than usual novelty¹." Luke obviously means, by his use of the imperfect tense in such a context, not that the Athenians really *had* no leisure, but that they *would habitually make* no leisure. They habitually said "*We have no leisure* for this or that." But if they had spoken the truth they would have said "We are not disposed to do this or that²." Mark, like Luke, uses the verb in the imperfect tense. Is it not possible, then, that Luke rejected the word here in his Gospel because it seemed to him to suggest that the disciples were like the Athenians, restlessly *refusing to "find leisure"* for something for which they ought to have "*found leisure*"?

This supposition Luke might deem incredible. But the Fourth Gospel indicates that there was a spirit of restlessness among the Five Thousand, which extended to the disciples, including ultimately almost all but the Twelve; and if we consider these indications along with the recent execution of John the Baptist by Herod, we shall perceive that there may be nothing absurd in the supposition that the Twelve themselves were restless and unsettled and not disposed to "find leisure" for "eating bread" in the presence of their Master with the "gladness and singleness of heart" to which He was gradually accustoming them³.

and (preferably) Wetstein on Mk vi. 31, quoting *Etymol.*, *Moeris*, *Thomas*, and *Phrynichus*.

¹ Acts xvii. 21 *εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ὑπαίρουν ἢ λέγειν τι ἢ ἀκούειν τι καινότερον*. It was not only to be "new" but "newer [than usual]." And their first object was to "say" something of this kind, their second, to "hear" it.

² Comp. Acts xxiv. 25, where Felix *says*—in answer to Paul's "reasoning" about "righteousness" and "the judgment to come"—"When I get a [suitable] season (*καιρὸν*) I will call thee unto me"; but he *means* "I am not disposed to listen to reasoning about 'righteousness,' I want money."

³ Acts ii. 46.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

The first intimation of this is in the exclamation of those who have fed on the loaves and fishes, "This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world," where it is added that Jesus perceived that they proposed "to take him by force to make him a king¹." Jesus reproaches them thus, "Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves²." They prefer "the meat that perisheth" to "the meat that abideth unto eternal life³." Jesus does not reproach the Twelve thus. But He implies that one of them (Judas Iscariot) deserved such a reproach ("one of you is a devil"); and to all of them He says "Will ye also depart⁴?" These would-be king-makers might be called—in the language of Matthew and Luke describing Christ's Temptation—instruments of the Tempter, tempting Jesus to pay Satan homage; and perhaps that thought underlies the Johannine saying "one of you is a devil."

If the disciples, amid the political excitement and course consequent on the death of John the Baptist, shewed some disposition to favour the views of the multitude, who wished to make their Master a king, that would explain not only Mark's brief and obscure mention of "want of leisure to eat," but also John's long and emphatic comment on the necessity of "eating," and on the impossibility of doing God's work without the sustenance of God's Bread, the "living" Bread, God's Word, God's Son.

Summing up the evidence as to the Marcan phrase about "leisure to eat," we find that the conclusion is doubtful as to its precise allusion and as to the reasons why Luke omits it. But there is a fair probability that it contains, or might be regarded in early times as containing, some allusion to the Hebrew thought of food as God's "seasonable" gift and to the expression of this by the LXX in the Psalmist's

¹ Jn vi. 14—15.

³ Jn vi. 27.

² Jn vi. 26.

⁴ Jn vi. 67—70.

language about God as giving food to His creatures "in its season¹." Further, there is evidence enough to justify our accepting, as a working hypothesis, the supposition that under Mark's original there was latent an obscure Eucharistic meaning. This, if existent, is wholly lost by Matthew and Luke, who omit the Marcan phrase, but not by John, who attempts to elicit and to expound it².

§ 8. "*To a desert place apart,*" in Mark and Matthew

It will be observed below that instead of "to a desert place"—where we should rather expect a "solitary" or "retired" place—Luke has "*to a city called Bethsaida*³." Mark himself mentions Bethsaida later on, immediately after the Feeding of the Five Thousand and before the Walking on the Waters. There, however, he describes the disciples, not as coming back *from* Bethsaida (as we should have expected from Luke's account) but as coming *to* Bethsaida, and the parallel Matthew

¹ See Ps. civ. 27, cxlv. 15, and the comment (in *Gen. v.*, on Gen. i. 3, Wü. p. 11) on Prov. xv. 23 "a word *in its season*, how good it is!" where it is maintained that the "word" is "*Light*," which God uttered "in its season" when He said, "Let there be *Light*!" and He saw that the Light was "good." The Lord's Prayer, and the Sermon on the Mount, and the Temptation, all point to the conclusion that Jesus taught that the Father in heaven is the Giver of every good thing, and of each in "its season," which is also "His season." The Eucharist includes this lesson.

² Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 20 *συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δείπνον φαγεῖν*. The various renderings of these words, and the interpretations of modern commentators, shew how other early Eucharistic traditions might be misunderstood.

³ Mk vi. 32

Mt. xiv. 13

Lk. ix. 10

And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart.

Now when Jesus heard it he withdrew (*ἀνεχώρησεν*) from thence in a boat to a desert place apart...

And he took them and retired (*ὑπεχώρησεν*) apart to a city called Bethsaida.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

omits "Bethsaida," while the parallel Luke omits both "Bethsaida" and the whole of the narrative that follows¹.

These facts indicate some early confusion about "Bethsaida." Instead of this name the Curetonian Syriac in Luke has "a desert place," while the Sinaitic Syrian has "to the gate of a city called Bethsaida²." Codex D has "village" instead of "city." The Latin and other versions mostly omit "city" and insert "desert place." One way of explaining not only these variations, but also Luke's inconsistency in "came to Bethsaida" and "we are here in a desert place," would be to suppose that Luke has mistaken *Beth Saida*, a poetic phrase meaning House of Provisioning, for the "city" of that name. The same Psalm that represents Israel as exclaiming "Can God prepare a table in the wilderness³?" says "He rained

1 Mk vi. 45	Mt. xiv. 22	Lk. ix. 18
And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before [him] unto the other side to Bethsaida....	And straightway he constrained the disciples to enter into the [or, a] boat, and to go before him unto the other side....	And it came to pass, as he was praying alone (καταμόνος)

Lk. ix. 18, which follows Luke's Feeding of the Five Thousand, is printed here to shew Luke's divergence at this stage from Mark and Matthew.

Mk vi. 47, Mt. xiv. 23, and Jn vi. 15 agree with Luke ix. 18 in representing Jesus as "alone (μόνος)" after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, but they mention it in their preface to the Walking on the Waters, which Luke omits.

² In Lk. ix. 10 (Curet.) "and he took (רבר) them apart-by-themselves and went to a place [that was] desert," the verb "took" in the form מברר (e.g. 1 S. xix. 14 (Targ. and Syr.) "to take (מברר) David") might be regarded as meaning (מברר), *midbar*, the regular word for "wilderness" in Hebrew and Aramaic. Walton's Syr. has "in locum desertum Bethsaidae," and *a*, *b*, *e* and *Brix*. all insert "locum desertum" without "urbs" or "vicus."

³ Ps. lxxviii. 19 Heb. "in the wilderness," but LXX, here and *ib.* 15, quite contrary to rule, has ἐν ἐρήμῳ, omitting the article. Contrast Exod. v. 1, vii. 16, viii. 20, 28 etc., and perhaps a hundred more instances, all ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. The Heb., when unpointed, might mean "the" or "a" wilderness. Israelites, when described in poetry as

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

down manna upon them to eat, and gave them of the corn of heaven... , he sent them *provision* to the full¹." Now the Hebrew for "*provision*" is there *Saida*. Poetically therefore it might be said that God in bringing Israel into the wilderness where He rained manna on them, brought them to "a house, or place, of *provision*," that is, "*Bethsaida*."

This view is confirmed from Greek sources. The Greek for "*provision*" is literally "*supplying with corn*," *episitismos*. This word applies exactly to the supply of manna. For manna was, as the same Psalm says, "*corn from heaven*," not "*bread*," but of the nature of "*corn*," since it had to be ground and seethed to make it eatable². *Episitismos* in LXX always corresponds to the Hebrew "*Saida*." It is used, in Genesis, of Joseph supplying "*provision*" from Egypt to his brethren, and, in Exodus, of the inability of Israel to supply themselves with "*provision*" for their journey into the wilderness³. The instance in Exodus would make the word peculiarly appropriate in the Psalm which represents God as making for Israel in the wilderness that "*provision*" which Israel could not make for themselves in Egypt. Similarly, we shall presently find Luke, alone among the Evangelists, representing the disciples as saying to Jesus, "Send away the multitude...that they may find *provision* (*episitismos*)⁴, because we are here in a desert

being new to the wilderness of Sinai, might speak of it as "a" wilderness, but afterwards as "the" wilderness.

¹ Ps. lxxviii. 25 "*provision*," צִידָה, ἐπισιτισμός (R.V. "*meat*").

² Ps. lxxviii. 24 "*corn* (דָּגָן)." LXX renders this word elsewhere 37 times (Tromm.) by σίτος, but ἄσπιτος only here—a mistranslation. On the grinding and seething of the manna see Numb. xi. 8. The mistranslation ("*bread*") is repeated by unbelieving Jews in Jn vi. 31. Jesus implies in His answer that it was *not* (ib. 32) "*the true bread out of heaven*." It should be noted however that "*the bread of the mighty*" is mentioned in Ps. lxxviii. 25.

³ Gen. xlii. 25, xlv. 21, Exod. xii. 39, ἐπισιτισμός here and elsewhere (11 times in Heb. LXX and alw. = צִידָה, *Saida*).

⁴ Lk. ix. 12 ἐπισιτισμός (R.V. "*victuals*"). It does not occur elsewhere in N.T.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

place." The coincidence is not likely to be accidental, especially since *episitismos* does not occur anywhere else in N.T. It is reasonable to believe that there is an allusion to Exodus, and to the "provision" of manna in the wilderness.

According to this view, Luke is right in retaining this word *episitismos*, unique in N.T., but wrong in duplicating it as "Bethsaida," and in placing "Bethsaida" at the beginning of the narrative. It should have come at the end. The disciples say, in effect, as the representatives of Israel, "We are in the wilderness. We are unable to *make provision* for the people. Send them away that they may *make provision* for themselves." Jesus replies by "*making provision*." Accordingly, after the gathering of the fragments, the conclusion of the narrative should have been: "Thus did the Lord lead His people that were in the wilderness into *a place of provision*, i.e. *into Bethsaida*." As a fact, Mark places a mention of Bethsaida in that position, though not in suitable context¹. Matthew omits "Bethsaida," and it is very probable that it is an error of Mark. If so, it is similar, and yet dissimilar, to that of Luke. Mark, like Luke, has perhaps confused a poetic phrase with a proper name. But unlike Luke, Mark has placed the name at the end of the narrative, whereas Luke (less correctly) has placed it at the beginning.

The Johannine equivalents to "desert place" or "wilderness" in the Feeding of the Five Thousand have been touched on above. As to Bethsaida John cannot be expected to intervene. As a rule, he avoids Synoptic names, being the only Evangelist that does not use the name "Gennesaret," and that does use "Tiberias." Bethsaida he mentions only in connection with Philip, who is "from Bethsaida²."

¹ Mk vi. 45 "unto the other side *to Bethsaida*," Mt. xiv. 22 om. "*to Bethsaida*."

² Jn i. 44, xii. 21. W.H. marg. has Bethsaida in Jn v. 2, but that is the name of a pool.

§ 9. "In the boat," in Mark¹

Mark, having previously told us that Jesus ordered that a boat should be constantly ready², now calls it naturally "the boat." Matthew, not having made this statement, calls it "a boat³." Luke does not mention it here, and rather implies that Jesus quietly withdrew on foot, and that the multitudes followed Him on foot afterwards, when they became aware of His departure⁴. John suggests the same thing at the beginning of his narrative, and afterwards suggests it again, or indirectly affirms it, with curious detail. First he says that Jesus (R.V.) "went away to the other side of (A.V. went over) the sea of Galilee⁵"; then he says that, after the Feeding, when the disciples came down to the sea for the purpose of going to Capernaum, they "entered into a boat." He does not here say "the boat," which would have clearly meant the boat in which they had come. And yet afterwards he says that "the multitude saw...that there was *no other boat* there, *save [only there had been] one*, and that Jesus entered not with his disciples into *the boat*, but that his disciples had gone away alone—howbeit there came (*or*, had come) [*other*] boats from Tiberias...⁶." These

¹ Mk vi. 32.

² Mk iii. 9. See *Proclamation* p. 377 suggesting that in the early Galilaean Church there may have been sometimes a play on the two words—almost identical in Aramaic and Syriac—"boat" and "teaching."

³ Mt. xiv. 13.

⁴ Lk. ix. 10—11 *ὑπεχώρησεν...οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γνόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ*. One would not infer from these words that Jesus "withdrew" by sea and the multitudes "followed" by land.

⁵ Jn vi. 1 *ἀπῆλθεν πέραν*. Nonnus adds "in a ship (*νῆϊ πολυκλήιδι ταμῶν ἀνθρώπιον ὕδωρ*)."
⁶ If that had been the meaning, it would have been easy to make it clear by substituting *διεπέρασεν* or *διῆλθεν* for *ἀπῆλθεν*. *Διαπεράν* is used in Mk v. 21, vi. 53, Mt. ix. 1, xiv. 34 about crossing the Lake, and *διέρχασθαι* in Mk iv. 35, Lk. viii. 22. The text of Jn suggests that Jesus passed into the translacustrine region without going across the Lake.

⁶ Jn vi. 16, 22. R.V. "save one," though literal, is misleading.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

statements—which can hardly be explained as originating from Johannine symbolism or dramatic picturesqueness—may perhaps be explained by supposing that there were very early differences of tradition about the manner in which Jesus and the disciples passed to, and returned from, the translacustrian scene of the Feeding of the Five Thousand¹. Later on, at the conclusion of the Feeding of the Four Thousand, we shall find Mark saying that Jesus crossed to “the parts of Dalmanutha,” whereas Matthew says that He crossed to “the borders of Magadan,” and there are reasons for thinking that both of these names are not real place-names but phrases mistaken for place-names, such as “*their haven*” or “*the parts [of the] opposite [coast]*”². If that is probable it strengthens the probability that, in the present Lucan passage, “Bethsaida” is not a place-name, but a phrase mistaken for a place-name, “*House of Provision*”³.

¹ In John, some mention of these details might seem necessary to explain how it came to pass that many of the Five Thousand, immediately after the miracle on the eastern side of the Lake, were addressed by Jesus in Capernaum, on the western side.

² Mk viii. 10, Mt. xv. 39. As regards “Dalmanutha,” see *Corrections* 498 g, h, which gives as alternatives (1) the emphatic form of the Talmudic word for “harbour”—a Hebraized form of *λιμήν*—preceded by the relative *d-*, so as to mean “belonging to the harbour,” (2) a transliteration, in Mark, of the preceding word “parts” (*μέρη*, מנות). But it should have been added that, against the second explanation, Prof. Dalman says (and gives evidence to shew) that (*Words* p. 66) “τὰ μέρη with the meaning of ‘district’ is a pure Graecism, quite incapable of being literally reproduced in Aramaic.” In Ps. cvii. 30 “the *haven* of their desire,” the Syr. has, for “haven,” a form of *λιμήν* (*Thes. Syr.* 1952, comp. 1941) common in Syriac. This favours the hypothesis called (1) above.

³ Comp. Macar. p. 85 “For He satisfied five thousand, having caused them to lie down *in the desert as if it were a Megalopolis* (ὡς εἰς μεγαλόπολιν κατακλίνας τὴν ἔρημον).”

§ 10. *Signs of conflation in Mark*

Writing of Christ's eastward passage together with the disciples across the Lake, Mark describes the people as "*knowing*" them and as "*running together* from all the cities." In the following verse he omits the Matthew-Luke tradition that Jesus "*healed*" the people, but inserts—what Matthew and Luke do not contain—that He "*taught*" them¹. Later on, writing of Christ's westward return across the Lake, Mark—as we shall presently find—says again that people at Gennesaret "*knew*" Him, and that they "*ran about*" or "*ran round*"². And there he adds, at great length, that the sick were healed by Jesus in the "*market-places*"³. Later still, after the Feeding of the Four Thousand, Mark describes Jesus as coming to "*Dalmanutha*." This name—non-occurrent elsewhere inside, or outside, the Bible—has been shewn to be explicable as an allusion to the Psalmist's "*haven*" in "*the haven* of their desire"⁴, a Hebrew word that occurs nowhere else in the Bible but is frequent in Aramaic, meaning "*open place*," "*street*," "*market-place*." Something of the nature of a *harbour* is suggested in the tradition peculiar to Mark "*they moored-to-the-shore*"⁵.

¹ Mk vi. 33—4.

² Mk vi. 54—5 περιέδραμον, "*ran about*," occurs nowhere else in N.T. In LXX it occurs twice and in both cases=Heb. שׁוּט (the word quoted above, pp. 28—9, from Amos and Daniel). The second instance of LXX περιτρέχω is Jerem. v. 1 "*Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem...and seek in the broad places thereof if ye can find a man, if there be any that doeth justly...and I will pardon her.*"

³ Mk vi. 56 ἀγοαῖς. Mt. xiv. 35 ("*they brought to him all the sick*") omits "*market-places*."

⁴ See note above, p. 40, on Ps. cvii. 30 "*haven* (מַחֲוִי)." Levy iii. 70 gives the word as = (1) "*city*," (2) *Machos*, the name of a place, (3) any enclosed place. Levy Ch. ii. 23 gives it as freq. = "*town with market-place*," and also "*market-place*," as in Lam. ii. 19 (Targ.).

⁵ Mk vi. 53 "...unto Gennesaret and moored-to-the-shore (καὶ

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

It is necessary to look forward here to these later Marcan passages in order to take a collective view of Mark's whole narrative. For if we find clear signs of reiteration in the employment of one word of prophetic use, such as "*run-to-and-fro*," we ought to be prepared to find them in other words. And if they are found, then we must recognise that all this Marcan account of the sequel of the Baptist's death must be regarded as coming from sources quite different from those of the narrative of the death itself. In that narrative there is diffuseness but little or no room for prophetic allusion, and there are few or no signs of Marcan "conflation." But here we seem to be in an altogether different atmosphere, so that we may expect continuous conflations such as might be exemplified in many LXX renderings, and especially in Daniel¹. The influence of this consideration extends beyond the Feeding of the Five Thousand to its sequel. This, in all the Evangelists but Luke, contains a description of Christ appearing to the disciples in their boat while, as Matthew says, it was being "*sorely tried* (literally, *tormented*) *by the waves*"; but Mark, besides saying that the disciples themselves were being "*sorely tried* (literally, *tormented*)" adds that they were "*in the act of rowing*"; and John, too, describes the disciples as "*rowing*"². Now the regular Hebrew and Aramaic word for "*row*" is the same as that which we have been commenting on above, as meaning "*run-to-and-fro*"

προσορμίσθων)," Mt. xiv. 34 "unto Gennesaret." Προσορμίζω does not occur in LXX nor again in N.T. Delitzsch renders Mark "*and they drew near to the dry land*," the Clementine transl. has "*and they drew near the shore of the sea*." D, SS, a, b, and Corb. omit it. Steph. Thes. vi. 1974 quotes figurative uses of it from Demosth. p. 795, 14 πρὸς οὓς αὐτὸς ἔχοντας λιμένας (misericordiae)...πρὸς τοὺτους μὴ προσορμίζον, and from Philostr. p. 717.

¹ See *Clue* 127 on Dan. iv. 19, also 105—111 on 2 S. xxiv. 19—20 compared with 1 Chr. xxi. 19—20, and 95 foll. on "Longer Conflations."

² Mk vi. 48, Mt. xiv. 24, Jn vi. 19.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

in Amos and Daniel¹. And the question will come before us whether John is here deliberately intervening in favour of Mark—against Matthew, who omits the word “*rowing*,” and still more against Luke, who omits the whole of the story about “*rowing*”—and, if so, in what sense whether symbolical or otherwise.

§ II. “*On foot*,” in Mark and Matthew²

Why does Luke omit “*on foot*”? One reason may be that in Hebrew, “a multitude following [a leader] *at his feet*” may be confused with “a multitude following *on their feet*”³. But another reason may be that Luke did not perceive a latent allusion in the Marcan phrase, which he consequently deemed superfluous.

Mark is describing a miracle akin to that of the Manna, which speedily followed the departure of Israel from Egypt. And the description of that departure contains the first mention of the phrase “*on foot*” to be found in our English Version of the Bible: “about six hundred thousand [that were] *on foot*”⁴. There the Hebrew adds “the men [of military age], besides children”⁵. Rabbi Ishmael explains that “children” includes

¹ Jon. i. 13 (Heb.) has the exceptional word חָתַר “dug [into the sea],” but the Targ. has שָׁטַח, which is used of “rowing” in Heb. of Is. xxxiii. 21, Ezek. xxvii. 8, 26.

² Mk vi. 33, Mt. xiv. 13. R.V. marg. “*by land*.” Delitzsch “*on their feet*.”

³ Clue 75—6 contains an attempt to explain Mk vi. 33, Mt. xiv. 13 thus. See 2 S. xv. 16—18 (*bis*) בְּרַגְלָיו, Walton “in pedibus suis,” (*semel*) בְּרַגְלוֹ, Walton “in pede suo,” R.V. (*ter*) “after him,” Targ. (*ter*) “cum illo,” LXX (1) τοῖς ποσσὶν αὐτῶν, (2) περὶ ἑ v. r. περὶ οἱ, (3) τοῖς ποσσὶν αὐτῶν. Comp. Jer. xii. 5 “thou hast run with the *footmen*,” LXX “thy *feet* run.”

⁴ “*On foot*,” so R.V. here (Exod. xii. 37), but the same Heb. is rendered “*footmen*” in Numb. xi. 21 “Six hundred thousand *footmen* (רַגְלִי) [are] the people....” See below, § 31.

⁵ Exod. xii. 37 “the men [of military age]” *ha-gebârîm*, Rashi “men above 20 years old.” The first instance of *geber* is in Exod. x. 11 “Go now, *the men* [among you]...,” where Moses has

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"women," and Rabbi Jonathan adds "the aged"¹—additions that may illustrate the words added by Matthew alone at the conclusion of both the Miracles of Feeding, "besides women and children²."

In the Fourth Gospel there is nothing on the surface to indicate Johannine intervention in favour of Mark here. On the contrary John rather seems to favour Matthew-Luke by himself saying, as they do, that the multitude "followed" Jesus³. He does not add "*on their feet*"; although, later on, he certainly implies that they did not come by boat and leaves us to infer that they came on foot⁴. The picture he gives us is of Jesus on a mountain, first looking down and seeing that the multitude that had been following Him is now approaching, and then descending to give them food. If therefore "*foot*" is to enter at all into the Johannine picture, it would seem that we are to think of the crowd as down below at the feet of Jesus, somewhat as the Song of Moses says concerning Israel at Sinai, "They sat down *at thy feet*, [everyone] shall receive (*marg.* received) of thy words⁵."

But John goes on to say "Now the passover, *the feast of the Jews*, was nigh⁶." And it is at all events worth noting that both in New Hebrew and in Aramaic the word "*foot*" is very frequently used to denote "*a feast*," and especially one of the three great feasts. Possibly therefore John may be following a tradition that explained "*on foot*" as "*at the feast*," to which

asked (x. 9) that "young" and "old" may go; Rashi explains that Pharaoh is refusing to let the children go.

¹ See *Mechilt.* on Exod. xii. 37. Jer. Targ. on Exod. xii. 37 adds "*none riding on horses except the children*"—apparently intended to explain antithetically the phrase "*on foot*" applied to the men.

² This addition is contained in Mt. xv. 38 as well as Mt. xiv. 21. See below on Mk vi. 44, p. 146 foll.

³ Jn vi. 2, Mt. xiv. 13, Lk. ix. 11 "followed."

⁴ See above, p. 39.

⁵ Deut. xxxiii. 3 LXX *ἐπὶ σέ*, Aq. *τοῖς ποσὶ σου*.

⁶ Jn vi. 4.

John added an explanatory context indicating that it was "*the passover*¹."

It is not contended that the Johannine "passover" is proved to represent the Marcan "on foot." The evidence is not sufficient for that. But, in view of the multitude of positive proofs of the rule of Johannine Intervention, the evidence is sufficient here for at least a negative conclusion—it is not proved that the rule fails, and there is nothing unreasonable in the supposition that the rule holds².

§ 12. "*He had compassion,*" in Mark and Matthew³

The verb here rendered "*had compassion*" means literally "*had [the] bowels [of his compassion opened]*⁴." In the Healing of the Leper Mark alone used this word⁵. Here Matthew follows Mark in using it, but Luke does not⁶. It is therefore a case where we should expect Johannine intervention.

If we ask why Luke omitted it here, we shall find that it cannot well be because the word is unknown in the LXX and in literary Greek; for Luke uses it elsewhere thrice, and once

¹ See Levy iv. 424—5, which shews that this meaning of "*foot*" was very common, and that the double meaning of the term was sometimes played upon. The phrase "*in the foot of*" also meant (ib.) "*on account of*," so that "they followed *on account of* Jesus [and His signs]" (comp. Jn vi. 2) might be expressed by "*at the feet of* Jesus." "*Foot*" is also thus used in Aramaic (Levy Ch. ii. 406 a). Gesen. 290 b renders לִפְתָּי (LXX ἐοράζω) not "feast," but "make-pilgrimage," "keep a pilgrim-feast."

² It is not contended that John is right. Further reasons will be given below (§ 31) for thinking that Mark's tradition alluded to the phrase "*on foot*," or "*footmen*," connected with the exodus of Israel from Egypt.

³ Mk vi. 34, Mt. xiv. 14.

⁴ Comp. the use of the noun in 1 Jn iii. 17 A.V. "shut up *his bowels* [of compassion]," R.V. "*his compassion*," τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ.

⁵ Mk i. 41, on which see *Proclam.* pp. 252 foll.

⁶ Mk vi. 34, Mt. xiv. 14 parall. to Lk. ix. 11 ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτούς.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

about Jesus¹. But it may be explained by his other contextual variations from Mark. Mark states, as the reason for compassion, "They were as sheep that had no shepherd," and then "He began to teach them many things"—as though the whole multitude were spiritually shepherdless and pitifully ignorant of spiritual things. Later on, Mark says about the disciples, "They understood not [the truth] about the loaves, but their heart was callous²"—as though, even by the disciples, some latent spiritual truth, underlying the sign of the Feeding, had been overlooked. All this is omitted by Luke. It would not suit his comparatively prosaic and passionless representation: "Having received (*or*, welcomed) them, He proceeded to speak to them about the kingdom of God, and to heal those that needed tendance³." Apparently Luke did not see that the occasion was one that called for a feeling so strong as to need the Marcan word to describe it.

Passing to John, we perceive that in accordance with Mark's brief observation—but at much greater length, and not in his own words but in words attributed to Jesus—he lays stress on the spiritual meaning of the Feeding, which not only the multitude but also almost all the disciples misunderstood. But neither here nor elsewhere in his Gospel does he mention "bowels of compassion." Can we say, then, that he implies it either here or elsewhere?

It will seem probable that he does, if we bear in mind the Johannine habit of dramatizing and ask ourselves how John would dramatically represent Jesus as "*having-bowels-of-compassion*." The Johannine Epistle says, about Him, "Hereby know we love, because *he laid down his life for us*, and we

¹ Lk. vii. 13 (of Jesus at Nain), x. 33, xv. 20 (all peculiar to Luke).

² Mk vi. 52, not in the parall. Mt. xiv. 33. Luke omits the whole narrative (the Walking on the Water).

³ Lk. ix. 11 ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς χρεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτο.

ought to *lay down our lives* for the brethren. But whoso hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need and *shutteth up his bowels* from him, how doth the love of God abide in him¹?" The "*shutting up of the bowels*" of compassion, then, is the Johannine opposite of Christ's sacrifice, or "*laying down life*" for others. It follows that the "*opening, or free action, of the bowels of compassion*" would be the Johannine equivalent of Christ's "*laying down His life for the brethren.*" Now though the word "*bowels*" is not mentioned in the whole of the Fourth Gospel, yet the thing—that is to say, a *yearning compassion for the hunger and the thirst of the sinful world*, and a longing to lay down life that the world may live—is implied, not only in the words "The bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world," but in the whole of the doctrine of the gift of His flesh and blood, enunciated "in synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum²."

If this view is correct, John is expressing dramatically and symbolically a moral and sacrificial view of the Feeding of the Five Thousand of which there is no trace in Luke. Mark and Matthew suggest it twice, first, by saying that Jesus "*had compassion*," and later on, in the Feeding of the Four Thousand, by representing Jesus Himself as saying "*I have compassion.*" John seems to attempt to make us feel that in this "sign" Jesus is (so to speak) "*doing compassion*," i.e. symbolically offering up Himself, as a sacrifice for men. In the Epistle to Philemon Paul calls Onesimus first his "*child*" and then his "*bowels*," and *The Testaments of the Patriarchs* represents Joseph as saying to his brethren "Pity the *bowels* of Jacob our father," meaning "Pity his *beloved son*³." Philo also represents

¹ 1 Jn iii. 16—17.

² Jn vi. 51—9.

³ Philem. 10, 12, *Test. XII Patr. Zab. ii. 2.* Comp. *ib. Neph. iv. 5* "until there shall come the *bowels* (σπλάγχνον) of the Lord, a man doing righteousness."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Jacob as calling Joseph "*my bowels*¹." Thus there was a connection, for Jews in the first century, not at first perceptible to us, between "*compassion*" and "*a son*," or rather "*a dear son*," "*a son specially beloved*."

If this connection is obscure to us it must have been much more obscure to Greeks in the first century. For to them the word "*bowels*," though conveying often the notion of some strong inward feeling, more often implied depth of resentment than depth of love². It was therefore an appropriate task for the Fourth Evangelist to make this connection clear. He himself certainly believed that the Sign of the Five Thousand was a sign of God's love in sending down His Compassion incarnate in Jesus Christ to give Himself as the living bread for the life of men. This he found hinted at in the Marcan tradition about "*bowels of compassion*," but only hinted at—and so obscurely that Luke passed it over in word and neglected it in thought. To remedy this defect John may have adopted "*Son*"—meaning "*a Son uniquely beloved, or only-begotten*"—as a Hellenic paraphrase for the Hebrew "*bowels of compassion*³." At all events he represents Jesus as teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum a consistent doctrine such as might be based on this paraphrase.

In conclusion we may naturally ask what induced Mark to use—if not to invent—this unprecedented Greek verb (unprecedented at least so far as researches of modern commentators go) to express Christ's compassion. Might he not have used

¹ Philo ii. 45 rhetorically represents Jacob as saying that the wild beasts, in devouring Joseph, devour τῶν ἐμῶν σπλάγχνων.

² See Steph. *Thes.* which alleges, as exceptional uses, σπλάγχνον "de utero," of fatherhood in Soph. *Oed. T.* 1066, and of motherhood in Pind. *Ol.* vi. 43 and Aesch. *Sept.* 1031.

³ Comp. *Test. XII Patr. Lev.* iv. 4, where the text has "The Lord shall visit all the Gentiles in His bowels [of compassion]," but several versions have, as a Christian modification, "in the bowels [of compassion] of His Son."

the verb "pitied," frequent in LXX and thrice used by himself¹? It is hardly enough to say Mark wanted to express abundant or extreme pity, for he could have added adverbs (as he adds them elsewhere) to express this².

It is reasonable therefore to look back to O.T. for some Biblical instance of a phrase implying "bowels of compassion." A notable one—almost the only one outside the prophets—occurs in Genesis, where it is said of Joseph that "*his bowels did yearn upon his brother*³." The context describes Joseph's brethren as coming to buy corn from him. Jewish Christians from a very early date would naturally accept Joseph as a type of Christ; and Joseph, giving food to his brethren in Egypt, might represent one aspect (a rudimentary one) of Jesus giving food to His brethren in the wilderness⁴. Then the compassion of Jesus for the multitude, whom He fed as His little ones, might be likened in early Christian poetry to the "bowels of compassion" of Joseph—who was himself called "the bowels of Jacob," as we have seen above—"yearning" for his beloved brother Benjamin, "the little one" among the Twelve. Thoughts of this kind may well have been in the mind of those who originated early Christian songs and poetic traditions concerning Christ's acts of compassion for the hunger and thirst of the multitudes.

¹ ἑλεεῖν, of which there are about 150 instances in O.T.

² E.g. σφόδρα, λίαν, περισσῶς.

³ Gen. xliii. 30 (where the marg. gives only 1 K. iii. 26 (apart from prophecy)). I have found no ancient comment on the rather curious use of "lift up the eyes" in the context (*ib.* 28—9) "And they [*i.e.* Joseph's brethren]...made obeisance. And he [*i.e.* Joseph] *lifted up his eyes*, and saw Benjamin his brother."

⁴ See Jerome on Ps. cv. 21 "He made him [Joseph] lord of his house." Jerome explains "house" as "the Church acquired by [His] blood."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 13. "*They were as sheep not having a shepherd,*" in Mark and Matthew¹

The mention of a shepherdless flock comes appropriately here in Mark, because it follows the account of the execution of John the Baptist whom many Jews had been regarding as their "shepherd." Matthew places it earlier, between what may be called a Circuit of Healing and the Mission of the Twelve². Luke nowhere inserts it. Textual grounds may suffice perhaps for a partial explanation of his omitting it here³. But Luke will be found also to omit, much later on, another Mark-Matthew tradition about "the shepherd"—the quotation, attributed to Jesus, "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered⁴." We must therefore not ignore the possibility that Luke may have been influenced by some doubt as to the utility of this tradition for his readers. The conception of a king as a shepherd is both Hebrew and Homeric. Yet it was liable to philosophic scoffing such as Epictetus addresses to Homer's Agamemnon: "What then are you? A '*shepherd*' in truth. For you weep like *the shepherds* when a wolf snatches one of their sheep⁵."

¹ Mk vi. 34, comp. Mt. ix. 36.

² Mt. ix. 35 "And Jesus went about all the cities and the villages, teaching...and preaching...and healing all...sickness." This is parall. to Mk vi. 6 "And he went about the villages round about, teaching." Neither Mk vi. 6 nor the parall. Lk. xiii. 22 (which adds "journeying to Jerusalem") makes any mention of "healing." Mt. ix. 36 proceeds "When he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη) for them because they were...as sheep not having a shepherd." Then follows (Mt. ix. 37, x. 1) the injunction to pray for "labourers" for "the harvest," and the Mission of the Twelve.

³ See below, § 15.

⁴ Mk xiv. 27, Mt. xxvi. 31, om. by Lk. xxii. 39 foll. The quotation in the Gospels differs from the Heb. of Zech. xiii. 7. There are special reasons why Luke might omit it. See *Son* (Index "Shepherd").

⁵ Epict. iii. 22. 35 "*snatches (ἀρπάγη)*," comp. Jn x. 12 "the

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

The Fourth Gospel, whether consciously alluding to such jibes or unconsciously using language that meets them, vindicates at all events the character of the ideal shepherd. It admits that the ideal has not been reached, and that all who have come forward hitherto, representing themselves as true shepherds, have been, as compared with the true Shepherd, "thieves and robbers¹." But it claims for the Good Shepherd a very different part. The thief (it says) comes to "steal" and to "destroy"; the wolf comes to "snatch"; the hireling "fleeth"; but the Good Shepherd comes, not only to give food to the sheep, but also, by "laying down his life" in conflict with "the wolf," to save them from being "snatched."

John has in mind the thought of the false king, the king of Babel, the hunter or "snatcher" of the souls of men, the wolf². The true king is He who, as Paul says, "being in the form of God, counted it not a [*prize-for-*]snatching to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant³." Yet the Jews in Jerusalem accused Jesus, in effect, of doing this very thing, "making himself equal with God⁴," that is to say, "*snatching at it as a prize*." And what are we to say to the fact that the only other Johannine mention of "*snatching*" comes at the conclusion of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, in a passage implying the complete failure of the multitude to understand the spiritual meaning of the sign: "They were about to come and *snatch him [away]* to make him king⁵"? Is it a mere accident that the sheep of Israel, whom Jesus

wolf *snatcheth* (ἀρπάζει) them." Perhaps one of Luke's reasons for omitting the tradition of Mk vi. 34 was that he thought it attached too great importance to the recent death of John the Baptist.

¹ Jn x. 8, see *Joh. Gr.* 2361—2.

² Philo ii. 41—42, 90 contrasts "shepherding" which is the fit training for a king, with "hunting" which is the training for war.

³ Philipp. ii. 6 "a [*prize-for-*]snatching (ἀρπαγμόν)."

⁴ Jn v. 18.

⁵ Jn vi. 15. Ἀρπάξω occurs in Jn, elsewhere, only in x. 12, 28, 29 (the Good Shepherd and the comment on it).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

came to save from "*the snatcher*," are here described as themselves desiring to "*snatch [away]*" their Shepherd that they may convert Him into a "king" after their own hearts—a veritable wolf? In imputing to John a deliberate choice of a peculiar phrase to describe a fact we do not impugn the fact itself. The fact in the present instance—the attempt to make Jesus a king—may be accepted as historical because of its antecedent probability, although no other Evangelist mentions it; but the choice of the word to express the fact may not improbably have been suggested by the Johannine sense of irony.

§ 14. "*Shepherd*" (sing.) *nowhere mentioned by Luke*

Both Matthew and Luke mention an owner of sheep as follows:

Mt. xviii. 12 (R.V.)

How think ye? if any man have a hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and go....¹, and seek that which goeth astray?

Lk. xv. 4 (R.V.)

What man of you, having a hundred sheep, and having lost one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine...., and go after that which is lost, until he find it?

The man's conduct seems open to censure—especially in Luke's version, which represents him as "leaving to themselves" or "abandoning²," the ninety-nine sheep. At all events opponents of Christianity might object to such a human shepherd as the type of the divine Shepherd. Perhaps some might say he was no true shepherd. Readers of Philo would know that he distinguishes the "cattle-feeder" from the "shepherd" as follows, "Now to those who allow their beasts to fill themselves with what they desire in a promiscuous mass we must

¹ R.V. "leave the ninety and nine and go unto the mountains," W.H. "leave the ninety and nine on the mountains and go."

² Lk. xv. 4 καταλείπει, comp. Mt. xviii. 12 ἀφήσει.

give the name of 'cattle-feeders,' but that of 'shepherds' on the other hand to those who give them what is needful and only what is exactly suitable¹." The man who "abandoned" his ninety-nine sheep (it might be urged) did not discharge the duty of a shepherd and was not worthy of the name.

Jerome gives two explanations of the parable. Some think (he says) that the Shepherd is the incarnate Son descending to save the one wandering sheep below, the human race (in which case the ninety-nine would be, presumably, the angels in heaven); others think that the ninety-nine are those whom He called "just persons that need no repentance²." In the latter case, the parable is still open to the jibe of Celsus, who asked "what evil" these just persons had done to incur the punishment of being abandoned³. It is only a prosaic or captious spirit that would take literally this "abandonment" of the safe and unwandering sheep, but still the Fourth Evangelist might naturally feel that there was room for another exposition of the tasks of the Good Shepherd in which He might be described as performing one task without neglecting another⁴.

Luke, in his only mention of "flock," calls it a "little one" and connects it with "kingdom," "Fear not, little *flock*; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the *kingdom*⁵"; and again, in his parallel to the Marcan passage that speaks of "teaching" and "sheep without a shepherd," Luke mentions

¹ Philo i. 306 "cattle-feeders," *κτηνοτρόφους*.

² Lk. xv. 7.

³ Orig. *Cels.* iii. 62.

⁴ Philo, besides quoting Numb. xxvii. 16 foll. from LXX "sheep that have no shepherd," with the paraphrase (i. 307) *χωρὶς ἐπιστάτου καὶ ἡγεμόνος*, also alludes to it (i. 170) *δίχα ἐπιστάτου καὶ ἡγεμόνος*, without quoting it. Such a condition he calls (*ib.*) *ὀρφανίαν* (comp. Jn xiv. 18).

⁵ Lk. xii. 32 *τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον*, on which see *Son* 3440 *b* quoting Clem. Alex. 953, who uses Lk. and Mt. xviii. 10 *μικρῶν* to illustrate Christ's doctrine of "little ones." This would make good sense, "*flock of the little-ones*," i.e. flock of the children of the New Kingdom.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"kingdom¹." Somewhat similarly in one of the Psalms, where the Hebrew has "he *shepherded* them," and the R.V. "he *fed* them," the Targum has "he *reigned* over them²." Such variations of rendering are all justifiable. But they imply preferences of this or that aspect of "*shepherding*."

Luke seems to like the royal aspect. John, if he does not dislike, at all events avoids it. He represents Jesus as using the word "*kingdom*" on only two occasions, namely, in dialogues with Nicodemus and Pilate, both of whom misunderstand it³. Also, in John, the flock is not called "little," though it is divided, at the close of his Gospel, into three classes, one of which consists of "little-sheep⁴." In the Parable of the Good Shepherd we are told that the sheep are of more than one fold, though they will all be brought together so as to make "one flock, one shepherd⁵."

§ 15. "*And he began to teach them many things,*" in Mark

The parallel Matthew-Luke makes no mention of "teaching," but Matthew mentions "curing," and Luke has "welcoming" and "speaking about the kingdom of God" and "healing⁶." An explanation of these variations is afforded by the hypothesis of an original Hebrew verb "*to shepherd*." Mark has given us a hint of this in his negative phrase above discussed ("sheep not having a *shepherd*"). But we have now to note that the Hebrew verb "*to shepherd*" occurs more frequently in the Bible than might be supposed. The English Version does not reveal it, because "shepherding" includes various actions such as feeding and tending, which may be expressed in English

¹ Mk vi. 34, Lk. ix. 11.

² Ps. lxxviii. 72.

³ See *Joh. Voc.* 1685 *a* quoting Jn iii. 3, 5, xviii. 36.

⁴ Jn xxi. 15—17 (txt doubtful).

⁵ Jn x. 16.

⁶ Mk vi. 34 ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά, Mt. xiv. 14 ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν, Lk. ix. 11 ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτο.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

by their several verbs "feed," "tend," etc. This is the first and probably the principal cause of variation. A second cause is the accidental similarity of the Hebrew verb "*shepherd*" to forms of the verb meaning "*know*" or "*cause to know*" (i.e. "*teach*").

This second cause has been discussed in a previous treatise¹. One of the instances there given deserves to be repeated here because it illustrates both causes at the same time: "The lips of the righteous [man] *shepherd* many²." Here "to *shepherd*" may mean "to *guide*," or "*tend*," as well as "*feed*," but LXX has confused it with "*know*," meaning "[*come to*] *know*," i.e. "*learn*." Moreover the LXX renders "many" (the Hebrew *rab*) as though it meant "great" or "lofty," and renders the whole sentence "The lips of the righteous [*come to*] *know* lofty [things]." This suggests an explanation of the phrase in our Marcan context "*and many knew [them, or him]*," as being an error for "*and he caused-to-know many*," i.e. either "*he taught many [persons]*," or "*he taught [them] many [things]*"—which is, in substance, the phrase at the heading of this section.

More important than this verbal cause is the cause placed first above—namely, the Hebrew thought and stream of tradition about God's "*shepherding*." Jacob illustrates it when he begins his career at Bethel, praying that the Lord would guide him, guard him, and feed him³; and he expressly mentions the word when he closes his career in Egypt, invoking

¹ See *Son* 3437 *c—d*, which refers to *Clue* 5, 7, and 90, and deals with Mk vi. 34 and the parall. Mt.-Lk. from the verbal point of view.

² Prov. x. 21 (R.V.) "*feed* (יָרַע)," LXX ἐπίσταται, "*learn*," or, "[*come to*] *know*," leg. יָדַע. Targ. retains the Heb. in רַעִין (Aram.), but in the sense "*treat-as-friends*" (Walton, "*placant*"), Aq. ποιμαίνουσι "*they shepherd*," Field "*pascunt* (i.e. *erudiunt*)."
In Job xxxii. 7, the causative "*make to know*" יָדַעוּ, i.e. "*teach*," is rendered by LXX "*know*."

³ Gen. xxviii. 20 "If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go and will give me bread to eat...."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"the God that *shepherded* me all my life long unto this day¹." Moses implied "*shepherding*" when he besought the Lord to appoint a successor to himself "that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep that have no shepherd²." And all his life testified that he too, like Jacob, recognised that the good shepherd on earth was the type of the Shepherd in heaven, the God that had guided Israel out of Egypt and guarded and fed them in the wilderness; to whom the Psalmist appealed as Shepherd of Israel and of whom the Psalmist said "The Lord is *my shepherd*, I shall not want³."

This last sentence is one of the very few quoted from the Psalms by Philo, who speaks of it ecstatically as a song that should be sung by every man that loves God, and above all by the Cosmos, or Universe, which is the "flock" of the living God who governs all things like a shepherd and a king⁴. Poets, he says, are wont to give to kings the title of shepherds of the people; but the Lawgiver (that is, Moses) gives this title only to the wise, who are real kings⁵. Elsewhere Philo declares that—however men may laugh at the notion—the only way of becoming a perfect king is to become an adept in the science of shepherding⁶.

¹ Gen. xlviii. 15—16 "The God that hath *shepherded* me all my life long unto this day, the Angel that hath redeemed me from all evil..." Gen. v. *ad loc.*, assuming that "*shepherding*" means nourishing, says that it is a greater work (as in Ps. cxlv. 16) to "*shepherd*" than to "*redeem*," the former being the act of "God," the latter of "the angel," and that the "*shepherding*" is as difficult as the cleaving of the Red Sea.

² Numb. xxvii. 17.

³ Ps. lxxx. 1, xxiii. 1. Comp. Hos. iv. 16 "The Lord will *shepherd* them, i.e. Israel," R.V. "*feed*," Targ. "*deducet*," LXX νεμήσει, Is. xl. 11 "Like a shepherd his flock shall he *shepherd*," and sim. Targ., LXX ποιμανεί.

⁴ Philo i. 308.

⁵ Philo i. 306.

⁶ Philo ii. 90 καί μοι δοκεῖ...μόνος ἂν γενέσθαι βασιλεὺς τέλειος ὁ τὴν ποιμενικὴν ἐπιστήμην ἀγαθός.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

In a very different strain, yet to the same effect, the Jewish comment on "The Lord is my shepherd" declares that the "shepherd" includes the three characters of Father, Shepherd (as Guide and Guardian), and Brother, and it adds a very early tradition that, although the occupation of the shepherd with his staff and scrip is commonly believed to be one of the meanest on earth, David "knew better." David argued thus: "Jacob called the Lord a Shepherd, saying 'The God that *shepherded* me all my life long'; therefore I, too, will call Him *a Shepherd* and will say 'The Lord is my *Shepherd*!'"

The longest of the historical Psalms leads up to the shepherding of Israel as its climax. It tells us how Israel wandered in the wilderness, "led" by God's "cloud" and "fire," and receiving from Him "manna," or "corn of heaven," and "bread" and "meat to the full," and "flesh." All these gifts—which imply guidance and food such as a shepherd gives—were yet to no purpose for Israel because "their heart was not right with him²." But the last three verses describe how Israel was finally "*shepherded*" by God's chosen representative: "He chose David also his servant and took him from the sheep-folds...to *shepherd* Jacob his people and Israel his inheritance; so he *shepherded* them according to the integrity of his heart and guided them by the skilfulness of his hands³."

¹ See *Tehill.* on Ps. xxiii. 1 (Wü. pp. 209—10) giving several traditions on "my shepherd." The first tradition of all is a comment on "*my*" (in "*my shepherd*"). It begins from Cant. ii. 16 "My beloved is *mine* and I am *his*," and passes to Exod. xx. 2 "I am Jehovah, *thy* God," Is. li. 4 "*my* nation."

² Ps. lxxviii. 14—37. In *ib.* 52 "he led forth his people *like sheep* and guided them in the wilderness *like a flock*," we are brought to the thought of the sheep, but not to the word "shepherd."

³ Ps. lxxviii. 70—72. This is quoted in *Exod. r.* on Exod. iii. 1 "And Moses was *shepherding* the flock," where it is said that Moses (as also David afterwards) divided the sheep into three classes (comp. Jn xxi. 15 foll.) according to age, so that he might feed them suitably. We are also told that Moses, finding a lamb that had

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Returning to the Synoptic tradition under consideration, we see that Mark's "began to teach them many things," though cold and inadequate in itself, becomes less inadequate if regarded in the light of the Marcan context, which depicts Jesus as compassionating the multitude because they were "as sheep without a shepherd." Luke's text, which mentions "welcoming" and "healing" as well as "speaking about the kingdom of God," is more adequate than the tradition of Mark ("to teach them many things") taken by itself, but misses the thought of "compassion" and all the deep pathos implied in Hebrew traditions about the divine Shepherd to whom Israel says, "My beloved is mine and I am his¹."

John may be said to combine the Marcan "teaching" with the Lucan "welcoming" and "healing"—only expressing the latter in a more vivid and passionate way. As to "teaching," he says—at the end of Christ's long discourse about the meaning of the Feeding of the Five Thousand—"These things said Jesus...as he *taught* in Capernaum²." But in the discourse itself, he declares in effect that, under this sign, the Shepherd of Israel was revealing Himself as purposing to give His own "flesh" and "blood," to be "living bread," food and life for the flock. This doctrine Jesus sets forth in such a form that Peter, despairing of finding any other shepherd like Him, exclaims, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast words of eternal life³." Thus John places before us two characters, briefly hinted at in Mark—the character of the Teacher and the character of the Compassionate Shepherd. The latter he

strayed away through thirst, took it on his shoulder to bring it back to the flock. Whereupon God said "Thou hast shewn compassion in leading sheep of flesh and blood. By thy life! thou shalt also shepherd my sheep, the flock of Israel."

¹ Cant. ii. 16.

² Jn vi. 59. *Διδάσκω*, in Johannine narrative, occurs elsewhere only in vii. 14, 28, viii. 20.

³ Jn vi. 68.

does not intend to describe or even to mention till later on¹. But he suggests it here, in anticipation, to the minds of those who meditated on the goodness of God towards Israel in preparing a table for them in the wilderness.

§ 16. "*When the day was now far spent,*" in Mark

At this point the Four Gospels diverge². The difference resembles one already discussed in the narrative of Christ's first public acts of healing, where Mark says that "it had become late" and the sun "[had] set," Matthew that "it had become late," but Luke that the sun was still "setting³." Here Mark's expression is "an advanced hour," a comparatively rare phrase⁴. Matthew uses the more ordinary Greek expression "*evening*." This however does not seem applicable to a time before the miracle but to one after it. And such an application John seems to give it when he says further on "When *evening* came his disciples went down to the sea⁵"; Mark also himself says that "when *evening* had come," the disciples were rowing "in the midst of the sea⁶."

Luke says, "*The day began to incline* (or, *decline*)," an expression that does not recur in N.T. except in his Gospel after the Resurrection, where he uses the perfect "Abide with us, for it is toward evening and *the day has now inclined*⁷."

¹ Jn x. 11 foll.

² Mk vi. 35 καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης (marg. γινομένης), Mt. xiv. 15 ὥσπας δὲ γενομένης, Lk. ix. 12 ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν.

³ Proclamation p. 213 foll. on Mk i. 32, Mt. viii. 16, Lk. iv. 40.

⁴ Wetstein on Mk vi. 35 quotes Dion. Hal. *Ant.* ii. 54 ἐμάχοντο καὶ διέμενον ἄχρι πολλῆς ὥρας...ἀγωνιζόμενοι ἕως ἡ νύξ ἐπιλαβοῦσα διέκρινεν αὐτούς. Steph. *Thes.* quotes Polyb. v. 8. 3, and Joseph. *Ant.* viii. 4. 3. Thucydides uses πολλή with νύξ.

⁵ Jn vi. 16 ὥς δὲ ὥσπια ἐγένετο.

⁶ Mk vi. 47 καὶ ὥσπας γενομένης ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης. This implies a time subsequent to that implied by John.

⁷ Lk. xxiv. 29 πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἐστὶν καὶ κέκλικεν ἡδὴ ἡ ἡμέρα.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

The "day," or the sun, is said to "incline" not only in Greek and Latin but also once in Hebrew¹, and it may "incline" toward "afternoon" as well as toward "evening." Luke, by saying "*began to incline*" here and "*has inclined*" elsewhere, seems to intend to emphasize "*began*" here, so as to mean "*incline toward afternoon*." In the story of Emmaus there are reasons for thinking that Luke is imitating the language of the LXX². But there are no such reasons here. It seems probable that Luke is here using an expression, frequent in Greek and Latin, and capable of meaning with slight modifications "afternoon" or "evening," by which he corrects an error of Mark's in such a way that a Greek reader of the Gospels might say: "Mark has taken '*when the day was inclining*' for '*when the day had inclined*' and has paraphrased it in the latter sense. Luke has restored the original phrase, leaving his readers to give it its correct sense."

Some Hebrew original like "between the two evenings"—used about the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb—might explain the Synoptic variations. Such an original has already been suggested as capable of explaining the Synoptic variations in the accounts of Christ's first public healing³. Still more appropriately would it explain them here. For in that earlier narrative there was nothing that pointed to the Passover. But there is much of that nature here. It is antecedently probable that the Galilaean Church would use expressions likening the Feeding of the Five Thousand to the Eucharist or to a prophetic sign of the Eucharist, a preliminary type of a Christian Passover.

¹ Judg. xix. 8 (R.V.) "tarry ye until the day declineth," (A.V.) "they tarried until afternoon (marg. till the day declined)." Gesen. 640 a gives practically no other instance. Steph. Thes. iv. 1651 gives instances from Greek and Latin. The "declining" may be toward "evening" or toward "afternoon."

² Comp. in Judg. xix. 7 ἐβιάσατο, and in Lk. xxiv. 29 παρεβιάσαντο, as well as the rare κλίνει ἡμέρα.

³ See *Proclamation* p. 213 foll.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

John himself tells us that "the Passover of the Jews" was "near¹." No doubt he means us to take this literally. But it would be characteristic of him to intend us also to take it as suggesting something more: "And another 'passover' was also 'near,' the Passover of the Christians." As the sacred Lamb of the Jewish Passover was slain for the sins of Israel "between the two evenings," so the same hour might be regarded in early Galilaean traditions as appropriate for Christ's announcement of the sign of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which He was destined to offer up as the Passover for the sins of the whole world.

§ 17. *"They continue with me now three days," in Mark and Matthew²*

The Feeding of the Four Thousand, in several of its expressions, gives to Christ's act a more personal note than is found in the Feeding of the Five Thousand³. It is more like Isaiah's description of the considerate Shepherd of Israel gently leading the flock⁴. Moreover Mark's preceding context

¹ Jn vi. 4.

² Mk viii. 2, Mt. xv. 32. It will be convenient to discuss the Feeding of the Four Thousand here, as a parallel to the Feeding of the Five Thousand, in order to compare and contrast the two.

³ Mk viii. 1—3 (R.V.)

Mt. xv. 32 (R.V.)

(1) In those days, when there was again a great multitude, and they had nothing to eat, he called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them,

(2) I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat:

(3) And if I send them away fasting to their home, they will faint in the way; and some of them are come from far.

And Jesus called unto him his disciples, and said, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days and have nothing to eat: and I would not send them away fasting, lest haply they faint in the way.

⁴ Is. xl. 11. Comp. Mk viii. 2 foll. "I have compassion" as compared with vi. 34 "he had compassion." And see Mk viii. 3 "If I send them away fasting...they will faint in the way; and

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

appears to be influenced by the language of Isaiah, describing the healing and safe guidance of ransomed Israel, returning to Jerusalem across the wilderness¹. This should prepare us to find traces of prophetic and poetic influence in the narrative that follows. Accordingly we find Jesus describing the multitude as "fasting," or "hungry," and as likely to "faint in the way," very much as the Psalmist says of the redeemed of Israel, "gathered" from the four quarters of the world, "They wandered in the wilderness in a desert way...hungry and thirsty, *their soul fainted in them*"². "Gathering" is not so easily applicable to the Exodus from Egypt³ as it is to the gathering of the scattered captives of Israel predicted by Isaiah, or to the gathering of the spiritual Israel contemplated in early Christian traditions⁴. To the latter there would apply the words in Mark (but not in Matthew) "*and some of*

some of them are come from far." There is nothing like this in the earlier narrative.

¹ Mk vii. 37 "He maketh even the deaf (τοὺς κωφοὺς) to hear and dumb [folk] (ἁλαλοὺς) to speak," Mt. xv. 31 "They saw dumb [folk] (κωφοὺς) speaking...and blind [folk] (τυφλοὺς) seeing; and they glorified the God of Israel." In Mark, the preceding context describes the healing of (Mk vii. 32) κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον, i.e. "deaf and stammering." Μογιλάλος, "*stammering*," occurs nowhere in the Greek Bible except here and Is. xxxv. ὁ τερὰν δὲ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων, Heb. "and the tongue of the dumb shall sing." Ibn Ezra reduces this to prosaic and non-miraculous fact by calling it "a figurative expression for '*they shall find water everywhere*,'" and contrasting Lam. iv. 4 "the tongue of the suckling cleaveth to the roof of his mouth for thirst." But Mark apparently takes the prophecy as predicting miraculous fact about the healing of a "*stammerer*."

² Ps. cvii. 2—5.

³ See however *Tehill. ad loc.* (Wü. ii. 134) "The Holy One said to the Israelites, 'In Egypt ye were scattered, and I gathered you in one little hour to Ramses; and now also are ye scattered into all lands, and as I gathered you in ancient days so will I gather you in the future,' as it is said... (Is. xi. 12) 'He shall gather the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.'"

⁴ Comp. Jn xi. 52 "that he might gather into one (εἰς ἓν) the scattered children of God."

them are come from far," applicable to the old remoteness of the Gentiles, illustrated by the language of Isaiah¹.

But we must be on our guard against confining Mark to one Prophecy or one Psalm as his source. The Psalm above quoted does not mention "*three days.*" But the account in Exodus on which the Psalm is based, does contain a mention of "three days" ("And they went *three days* in the wilderness and found no water") previously mentioned as the time necessary for a journey to be taken for the purpose of offering a sacrifice to Jehovah². Then, further, if we examine other Hebrew texts, or Jewish traditions about "*three days,*" or "*the third day,*" beginning from the sacrifice of Isaac on Mount Moriah, we shall find that, both in the Bible and in the Midrash and in Philo, as also in the words of Jesus about Himself, a mystical meaning is attached to the phrase³. In Philo, the sacrifice of Isaac is connected with that perfect tribute which will be duly paid by the mind, when "perfected," to the "perfecting" God: "When therefore does it duly pay? When it arrives *on the third day* at the place whereof God spoke to it⁴." He goes on to speak of the mind at this stage as passing

¹ Eph. ii. 17 "And he came and preached peace to you that were far off and peace to them that were nigh," comp. Is. lvii. 19 "Peace, peace, to him that is far off and to him that is near."

² Exod. xv. 22, comp. *ib.* iii. 18, v. 3, viii. 27.

³ Gen. xxii. 3—5 "And Abraham rose up early in the morning and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him and Isaac his son. . . . *On the third day* Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place afar off. And Abraham said unto his young men, Abide ye here with the ass. . . ." The context implies, but does not mention, "*two days,*" preceding. Josephus mentions it, as follows: *Ant.* i. 13. 2 "Now the two servants went along with him *two days*; but *on the third day*, as soon as he saw the mountain, he left those servants that were with him till then in the plain. . . ."

⁴ Philo i. 457 (playing on τέλος and its compounds) τελειωθείς ὁ νοῦς ἀποδώσει τὸ τέλος τῷ τελειοφόρῳ θεῷ... Πότε οὖν ἀποδίδωσιν; Ὅταν (Gen. xxii. 4) ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον...τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ παραγένηται....

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

by distinctions of time and migrating into "the timeless nature¹."

The very great difference of Philo's language from the simple style of the Gospels must not altogether hide the underlying resemblance of thought between this and the saying of Jesus about being "*perfected on the third day*²." The Midrash on the story of Abraham takes as its first illustration the words of Hosea "After *two days* will he cause us to live [again]; *on the third day* he will raise us up and we shall live before him³." Then, after enumerating other instances of the phrase, it introduces into the story of Abraham (what Josephus perhaps also implies in his mention of "two days") a distinction between the "servants" who do not accompany Abraham "*on the third day*," and the son who does. Abraham sees the Shechinah over the mountain, and asks his son and his two servants whether they see what he sees. The son says "Yes." The two servants say "No⁴," being only (so to speak) in the second-day stage. To them accordingly it is said "Abide ye here with the ass." But the son (it is implied) having entered the third-day stage, is allowed to go on and to be perfected on the Mount of Sacrifice.

The frequency with which Jesus is recorded in all the Gospels to have used the phrase "on the third day," or some similar expression, about His own resurrection, or about the restoration of the Temple, or about the approach of the Passover, makes it probable that here, in the Feeding of the Four Thousand, it is used in some allusive sense. Perhaps it

¹ Philo *ib.* παρελθὼν τὰς πλείους μοίρας τῶν χρονικῶν διαστημάτων καὶ ἤδη πρὸς τὴν ἄχρονον μεταβαίνων φύσιν.

² Lk. xiii. 32—3 "I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow and *on the third [day]* I am [to be] perfected (τελειοῦμαι). Howbeit I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the *next [day]*, for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."

³ Hos. vi. 2.

⁴ This resembles (I think) something in Wagner's *Parsifal*.

alludes to the precept twice enjoined on Israel at the Giving of the Law, "Be ready *against the third day*¹." Origen speaks of the Four Thousand as being "*testified to*," in respect of their "abiding by the Lord *for three days*²." Clement of Alexandria, writing of Abraham's "*seeing on the third day*," says that "*the three days* are the mystery of the seal³." In view of the extracts given above from Scripture, Midrash, Philo, and the Gospels, it would be unwise to dismiss these Christian comments as baseless Christian allegorizing⁴. They all point back to a widespread Hebrew conception of "*the third day*," as being not only a phrase of time but also a phrase of accomplishment, what Philo calls "a timeless nature⁵."

Passing to the Fourth Evangelist we have to consider his attitude, first, toward the Mark-Matthew tradition about a supplementary miracle of Eucharistic Feeding, and secondly, toward this mystical tradition about "three days." As to the first, while nowhere denying that there were, even before the Resurrection, other similar miracles such as the Feeding of the Four Thousand, he turns our attention to something that

¹ Exod. xix. 11, 15.

² Origen *Comm. Matth.* xi. 19 (Lomm. iii. 123).

³ Clem. Alex. 690. Comp. Clem. Alex. *Excerpt. Theod.* 988—9 where "baptism" is called ἡ σφραγίς and τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας σφράγισμα, and see Euseb. iii. 23. 8 (quoting from Clem. Alex.) τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ κυρίου.

⁴ Jerome, however (on Mt. xv. 32), affords an instructive instance of the excesses of the Christian transmutation of Jewish tradition, "Miseretur turbae quia *in trium numero*, Patri, Filio, Spirituique Sancto credebant."

⁵ See p. 64, n. 1. Mark (iv. 28) speaks of (1) "the blade," (2) "the ear," (3) "the full corn." John (xii. 24) speaks of the grain of corn (1) falling, (2) dying, (3) producing fruit. Revelation (i. 4) speaks of the IS and the WAS and the COMING. Underlying the whole of the Fourth Gospel there seems to be the conception of (1) the Thought, (2) the uttered Thought, or Word, (3) the influencing Thought, or Spirit. All these are forms of the *thought* of "the third day."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

happened after the Resurrection, supplementary, but dissimilar in important details—a quiet and homely little meal, the relation of which to the Synoptic narratives will be discussed as we proceed. As to the second point, the doctrine of “three days,” John teaches that it referred to the raising up of what Jesus and the Jews called “this temple,” but that it meant “the temple of his body¹.” No doubt, this included (in the Evangelist’s judgment) the manifestation of Christ in the body to the disciples after death. But it certainly included also the rising up of Christ’s Body in the sense of the Church, the New Temple. In that connection, we should have to use the Philonian phrase again and say that the “three days” had “a timeless nature².”

¹ Jn ii. 19—21.

² On the difficulty of making any confident assertion about the number of Christ’s visits to the Temple, see *Introd.* pp. 90—6. John may have desired to impress on his readers, at the very outset of his Gospel, that Jesus regarded the Temple as being a Congregation of human beings, that is to say “sons of men,” built up on, and into, one ideal Son of Man, who was also Son of God. As John expounds the Doctrine of Bread before its chronological place, in connection with the Feeding of the Five Thousand, so he may have briefly expressed the Doctrine of the New Temple before its chronological place, in connection with what he believed to be Christ’s first public visit to the Temple.

§ 18. "Buying" or "Whence?"

In the texts printed below¹ the following are the most remarkable agreements and disagreements. (1) The four narratives of the Five Thousand speak of "buying," though in varying contexts. (2) The two narratives of the Four Thousand omit "buying" and ask "whence?" (3) John combines "buying" with "whence?" (4) Mark repeats "buying" twice ("that they may buy," "are we to buy?"). (5) Matthew has merely "that they may buy." (6) Luke has merely "unless we are to buy." (7) In the Synoptists, "buying" (or "whence")

¹ Mk vi. 35—7
(R.V.)

Mt. xiv. 15—16
(R.V.)

Lk. ix. 12—13
(R.V.)

Jn vi. 5—7

(35) And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said, The place is desert, and the day is now far spent:

(36) Send them away, that they may go (*ἀπελθόντες*) into the country and villages round about, and buy themselves somewhat to eat.

(37) But he answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go (*ἀπελθόντες*) and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread (*λίτ.* loaves), and give them to eat?

(15) And when even was come, the disciples came to him, saying, The place is desert, and the time is already past; send the multitudes away, that they may go (*ἀπελθόντες*) into the villages, and buy themselves food.

(16) But Jesus said unto them, They have no need to go away (*ἀπελθεῖν*); give ye them to eat.

(12) And the day began to wear away; and the twelve came, and said unto him, Send the multitude away, that they may go (*πορευθέντες*) into the villages and country round about, and lodge, and get (*εὐρωσῶν*) victuals: for we are here in a desert place.

(13) But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said, We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; except we should go (*πορευθέντες*) and buy food for all this people.

(5) Jesus therefore lifting up his eyes...saith unto Philip, Whence are we to buy bread (*λίτ.* loaves), that these may eat?

(6) Now this he said tempting (*or*, trying) him, for he himself knew what he purposed (*or*, was destined) (*ἐμελλε*) to do.

(7) Philip answered him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread (*λίτ.* loaves) is not sufficient for them, that each may take a little.

Lk. ix. 14 *a* adds here "For they were about five thousand men," which is parall. to Mk vi. 44, Mt. xiv. 21.

Mk viii. 4 (R.V.)

And his disciples answered him, Whence shall one be able to fill these men with bread (*λίτ.* loaves) here in a desert place?

Mt. xv. 33 (R.V.)

And the disciples say unto him, Whence should we have so many loaves in a desert place, as to fill so great a multitude?

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

is uttered by the disciples; in the Fourth Gospel, "*whence*" and "*buy*" are uttered by Jesus identifying Himself with the disciples ("*whence are we to buy?*").

In these passages, "*whence*" means "from what possible source," with an assumption that there is no possible source. "*Whence*," in any sense, is rare in LXX; but in this sense it does not occur more than thrice¹. The Pentateuch has but one instance. That occurs in a remonstrance of Moses, somewhat similar to the remonstrance of the disciples. Moses pleads that he cannot feed Israel in the wilderness. "*Whence to me flesh*," he asks, "to give to all this people²?" "*Whence to me flesh?*" means, of course, "*Whence could I get flesh?*" But we might supply other verbs such as "*find*," or even "*buy*."

Moses adds "Shall flocks and herds be slain for them to *suffice* them? Or shall all the fish of the sea be gathered... to *suffice* them³?" "*Suffice*"—a rare word both in LXX and in Gospels—occurs in the Johannine answer to the question "*Whence?*" asked by Jesus. "Two hundred pennyworth of loaves does not *suffice* for them," says Philip, "that each may take a little⁴." This combination of the rare words "*whence*" and "*suffice*," together with the similarity of circumstances, leads to the conclusion that John has in view, not only the Gospel traditions about the Feeding, but also the remonstrance of Moses. There is also a fair, though slighter, probability that the same remonstrance underlies the Mark-Matthew tradition.

¹ "*Whence?*" in "*Whence (πόθεν) comest thou?*" etc. occurs in Gen. xvi. 8, xxix. 4, etc. But, in the sense "from what possible source?" (implying "there is no possible source") it occurs (in A.V.) only in Numb. xi. 13, 2 K. vi. 27, Nahum iii. 7.

² Numb. xi. 13.

³ Numb. xi. 22, see below, p. 69, n. 3.

⁴ Jn vi. 7. Ἀρκέω occurs only eight or nine times in canon. LXX and four times in the Gospels.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

This hypothesis—of a brief original like that in Numbers “*Whence [should there accrue] to me flesh?*” or, still better, one in which “to me” was omitted—might explain the extraordinary Gospel variations as to “*buying*.” No verb being in the original, evangelists would have to supply one—such as “*get*,” “*find*,” or “*buy*.” Compare the Mark-Matthew “that they may *buy* food,” parallel to the Lucan “that they may *find* provision (R.V. get victuals).” This may be illustrated from Proverbs “A scorner seeketh wisdom and [*doth*] not [*find it*],” where “*find*” is supplied by the LXX and English Versions¹.

In the Feeding of the Four Thousand, Mark’s parallel to Matthew’s (lit.) “*Whence to us so many loaves as to fill so great a multitude?*” is “*Whence shall one be (SS art thou) able to fill with loaves these men?*” This indicates that the original had no definite personal pronoun. Also the Syro-Sinaitic of Mark has “*find*” for “be able.” These small links of verbal evidence connect the Gospel narratives both with one another and with that in Numbers which represents Moses as twice asking, in the Hebrew text, “shall it be *found* for them?”

From “finding” to “buying” is a transition of thought that may be illustrated from Job and Isaiah. Job asks “Where shall wisdom *be found*?” and proceeds to speak of “*the price*”

¹ Prov. xiv. 6. Comp. 1 S. xxvi. 18 (A.V.) “What evil [*is*] in my hand?” LXX *εὐρέθη ἐν ἐμοί*, Job xii. 12 (A.V.) “With the ancient [*is*] wisdom,” (A) *εὐρίσκειται*, Prov. v. 4 (Heb.) “Her end [*is*] bitter,” LXX *εὐρήσεις*, i.e. “*thou wilt find it bitter*.”

² In Mk viii. 4 *πόθεν δυνήσεται τις*, SS has literally “*Whence dost thou find [power]?*” *Thes. Syr.* 4147—8 shews that the radical meaning of the word is “find,” and it is easy to see that “*I find [how] to do*” may mean “*I am able to do*.”

³ Numb. xi. 22 (Heb.) “Shall flocks and herds be slain...and shall it be *found* (LXX *ἀρκέσει*) for them... (rep.) and shall it be *found* (LXX *ἀρκέσει*) for them?” i.e. “shall sufficient food be found for them?” No persons are indicated as the finders. See Gesen. 593 b and 594 a indicating that the literal translation is “and so *one find [enough] for them*,” i.e. shall it be found.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

as being beyond all silver, gold, and jewels¹. Isaiah says "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come ye, *buy* (*shâbar*) and eat; yea, come, *buy* (*shâbar*), without money and without price, wine and milk²." The word *shâbar* is not often used for "*buy*." It means "*buy-corn*." Rashi, on Isaiah, says that it is used here as in the words "*to buy corn*"—alluding to the first Biblical use of the word in the description of "all countries" coming "into Egypt to Joseph *to buy-corn*³."

This allusion brings out the prophet's meaning: "Egypt sells its corn for a price. But God sells you His corn, the corn of heaven, the Law of Righteousness, without money and without price⁴." The Greek word used in the Gospels for "buying" is the same as that used by the LXX about the buying of corn in Genesis and the wine and milk in Isaiah. Consequently, in any Christian narrative that described the feeding of the multitudes by Christ in a form intended to symbolize the spiritual food of the Eucharist, it would be appropriate to use the word "*buy*" by way of contrast, in such a way as to make it clear that Christ's bread could *not* be "bought"—or, at all events, not bought in the ordinary sense of the word.

But the Synoptic Tradition does not make this clear. It speaks about the Five Thousand as (possibly) (Mark-Matthew)

¹ Job xxviii. 12—19.

² Is. lv. 1, Targ. "Come, hearken and learn, without price and without money, doctrine that is better than wine and milk."

³ Gen. xli. 56—7 contains the first Biblical instances of *shâbar*. The causative means "*sell [corn]*" and the active "*buy [corn]*." A.V. "*sold* unto the Egyptians. . . all countries came. . . to *buy [corn]*." LXX ἐπώλει. . . ἀγοράζειν.

⁴ Ibn Ezra, on Is. lv. 1, says that wine and milk "serve both for food and drink." He seems to anticipate the objection that *shâbar* ought not to be applied except to that which is eaten. Rashi, on Genesis, says (if the text is genuine) "You must not say that *shâbar* is used only of corn, for it is used also of *wine* and *milk* (Is. lv. 1)."

"going away and buying" or (Luke) "going and finding," and also about the impossibility that the disciples should (Mark) "go away and buy" or (Luke) "go and buy¹"; but it so distracts us with verbal variations that we are in danger of learning nothing from the words². "They were uttered by the disciples," we may say, "not by Jesus, and the disciples were in the dark, and did not know what they were speaking about."

John, without denying that the disciples used these expressions about "*buying*," and also about the impossibility of finding "*whence*" they might procure food in any way, declares that Jesus Himself used expressions of this nature, and that He did it in a kindly and gentle (we may almost say playful) spirit, "*tempting (or, trying)*" Philip. The Evangelist's view is that Jesus had reasons for choosing this particular disciple—a little slow perhaps, but sure and straightforward—in order to lead him, and through him the rest of the Apostles, towards a higher stage of revelation. It was not the highest but only a higher. "He himself"—John says, in a kind of aside—"knew what he would do," but He did not at present say "what he would do." He merely prepared Philip for expecting at once, and for receiving later on, some mystical

¹ "Going away" = ἀπελθόντες. "Going" = πορευθέντες. R.V. makes no distinction here, though rendering the infin. ἀπελθεῖν "go away" in Mt. xiv. 16.

² The key to the original is perhaps to be found in the deliberative subjunctive ἀγοράσωμεν, found in Mk, Lk., and Jn, and meaning "ought we, or, are we, or, we are, to buy." "Ought" is expressed in Heb. by (1) the future ("Thou shalt, i.e. *oughtest to*, do"), (2) the infin. after "it is" ("It is [fit] to do," "it is [fit] for thee to do"). Confusion might arise between "Is it [fit] to go away and buy?" and "It is [fit] to go away and buy." The former would be taken as "Is it [fit] for us [i.e. the disciples]?" the latter, as "It is [fit] for them [i.e. the five thousand]." See *Oxf. Conc.* LXX δεῖν, and e.g. Ezek. xxxiv. 2 Heb. "Shall [i.e. should] they not feed?" LXX οὐ βόσκουσιν (interrogative). The ambiguity might be increased by two datives "[fit] for us to buy for them."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

doctrine about the spiritual Bread. "He himself knew what he would do" means "He knew what He was destined to do on the Cross, buying the Bread of Life for the world at the cost of His blood¹."

§ 19. "*Two hundred pennyworth,*" in Mark and John²

Why was this precise sum mentioned by the disciples, or recorded by Mark to have been mentioned by them? Why did Matthew and Luke omit Mark's tradition? Why did John insert it? The question here is not whether John intervenes for Mark, but why?

"Two hundred pence (*or*, denars)" is a sum frequently specified in Talmudic enactments about fines, damages, marriage portions, etc.³ Also, if a man had an income of less than two hundred denars, he could claim certain exemptions and allowances. It was legally recognised as being, so to speak,

¹ For this mystical meaning of the word "buy," ἀγοράζω, John has previously prepared the way by representing the disciples (Jn iv. 8, 32) as leaving their Master alone and going "to buy" food in Sychar (which He rejects, telling them that He has food to eat that they know not of). The third and last instance of ἀγοράζω is where Judas Iscariot, going forth to betray the Master whom he has sold, is regarded by some of the disciples (Jn xiii. 29) as being instructed by Jesus to "buy" something needed for "the feast [of the Passover]."

But what are we to say as to the plural "*loaves*" ("whence are we to buy *loaves*?") assigned by John to Jesus here and nowhere else except in the reproach (Jn vi. 26) "ye ate of *the loaves*"? Does the Evangelist represent Jesus as speaking, as it were, down to the level of Philip, about the rudimentary food to be provided on this occasion? If so, we may illustrate from the plural (Jn iv. 8) "buy *food(s)* (τροφάς)," unique in N.T., where the "foods" are called by Origen *ad loc.* "suitable foods (τροφάς) with the heterodox (παρὰ τοῖς ἑτεροδόξοις)," and Ammonius (*ad loc.* Cramer p. 216) sees a warning against "various foods of luxury (ἐδεσμάτων)." Τροφαί is used of "forbidden foods" in 4 Macc. i. 33, iv. 26 (comp. 3 Macc. iii. 7).

² Mk vi. 37, Jn vi. 7.

³ See *Hor. Heb.* on Mk vi. 37. Wetstein is silent.

"a poor man's income¹." Christ's disciples were poor men. Hence, when exhorted by Jesus to give bread to the multitude, one of them might be supposed to reply "Even if we had the whole of our year's income in our hands, should we go away and spend it all in a single meal—and that, too, insufficient—for this multitude?"

Thus explained, the Marcan tradition becomes intelligible. But, outside Palestine, who would know the explanation? Moreover, even with this explanation, it is not clear, because Mark at this stage has not yet told us the number of the multitude, and does not mention it till the very end of the narrative². This omission may be contrasted with the orderly insertion in the O.T. narrative of the meal given by Elisha to the sons of the prophets. Elisha's servant, receiving "*twenty loaves of barley*," says at once, "What! Shall I set this before *an hundred men*³?" Similarly Luke, in his parallel to Mark, lets us know at once the number of the multitude thus "Unless we are to go and buy food for all this people—for *they were about five thousand men*⁴." Without this knowledge, the inadequacy of two hundred denarii is by no means obvious. For a denarius was a labourer's daily wage⁵ and could presumably suffice for one simple meal for several labourers. Two hundred denarii might therefore well provide for a single meal for a considerable number, quite large enough to be called a "multitude."

Again, "two hundred denarii" might possibly imply *gold*

¹ *J. Pea* viii. 8 (Mishna) and *Sota* 21 b. *Hor. Heb.* omits this. So also does Schlatter on *Jn* vi. 7.

² *Mk* vi. 44.

³ *Hor. Heb.* on *Jn* vi. 9 refers to 2 *K.* iv. 42 and *Chetub.* 105. 2, 106. 9, where "the masters enhance the number of men fed by Elisha to two thousand two hundred" from the Scriptural "one hundred."

⁴ *Comp. Numb.* xi. 13 "Whence should I have flesh to give to *all this people*?" *ib.* 21—2 "The people...are *six hundred thousand*...shall flocks and herds be slain for them to suffice them..."

⁵ *Mt.* xx. 2—13.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

denarii. In that case—since a gold denarius was worth twenty-five silver denarii—the sum would amount to five thousand silver denarii, that is to say, the daily wage for five thousand men¹. Then the meaning of the expostulating disciples would be “Are we [so rich that we are] to go and buy bread for two hundred [gold] denarii and to give them to eat [a meal worth a day’s wage for each man]?”

This is an improbable supposition. For “denarii,” without the epithet “gold,” would be taken by all to mean “silver denarii.” But difficulties like these may explain, not only why Matthew and Luke omitted Mark’s tradition about the denarii, but also why Matthew modified the context by transferring “go away” from the disciples to the multitude (“they have no need to go away”), as indicated above², and why Luke inserted at this stage the number of the multitude³.

John retains Mark’s “two hundred pence,” but assigns the expression to Philip instead of to the disciples collectively. He does not follow Luke in inserting the number of the multitude

¹ See *Son* 3420 *g* referring to *Levy* i. 399 *b*. Wagenseil’s *Sota* p. 552 has an obscure remark about a dower of 200 denarii “ut ita ducenti isti denarii efficiant omnino (?) xxv denarios argenteos, quorum cujusque pondus xxvi grana hordacea.” If “each” were written for “altogether (omnino),” this would seem to be a confused statement about denarii of gold, as being each worth twenty-five denarii of silver. The mention of a grain of barley as a standard of weight for denarii is perhaps worth noting, in view of the Johannine mention of denarii and barley loaves in the same context.

² See p. 67, comp. p. 71, n. 2.

³ Another possible cause of corruption can be but briefly indicated. In Greek, the sign of “5000” is ϵ and the sign of “200” is C’, and ϵ and C are frequently confused. Schlatter (on *Jn* vi. 7) quotes *Siphr.* Deut. 355 “Oil for (Ϸ) a hundred myriads do I need”—where Ϸ seems to mean “for the sake of,” somewhat like *Gen.* xviii. 28 (*Gesen.* 90 *b*) “on account of five,” but it usually means “at the price of.” Perhaps “for 200 denarii,” in Greek, when “denarii” was denoted by a sign, might be confused with “for five thousand [men].” Or ἀγοράσωμεν δηναρίων with C’ might be corrupted into ἀγοράσωμεν δὲ ἀνδρῶν with ϵ.

here to shew the inadequacy of the sum. But he represents Philip as saying that it would be quite inadequate. As to the "pence," he makes no effort to shew what may have been in Philip's mind, but he seems to suggest, as being in Christ's mind, a very different kind of "buying"—namely, what might be called a "ransoming" of the souls of men at a price above visible "denarii."

The first Biblical mention of "ransoming" the "soul" occurs in connection with the numbering of the Israelites. They are to give "every man a ransom for his soul¹." The Law proceeds "*This* shall they give...half a shekel." The Jerusalem Targum explains "*this*" by adding "This valuation was shewn to Moses in the mountain as with a *denarius* of fire²." In one of the many forms in which this tradition is repeated, it is said that God's words so terrified Moses that he replied "Who can give a ransom for his soul?" It was then (said R. Meir) that God shewed Moses a coin of fire and said "*This* shalt thou give³."

The three Synoptists agree that on one memorable occasion Jesus called for a denarius and said to the Pharisees "Whose is this image and inscription⁴?" To this they replied "Caesar's." He then bade them give "to Caesar that which is Caesar's." Presumably that which was "*Caesar's*" meant the denarius. And it was "*Caesar's*" because it was stamped

¹ Exod. xxx. 12. In Exod. xxi. 30 (A.V.) "*ransom* of his life (*lit.* soul)," R.V. has "*redemption*" (see context).

² Similarly Rashi says "God shewed Moses a coin of fire of which the weight was half a shekel, and said, *This* (istiusmodi) shall the Israelites give."

³ See *Numb. r.* Wü. pp. 275—6, also *Pesikt.* (Piska II) Wü. pp. 10—21, and *ib.* Wü. p. 76. In some forms of the tradition, it is explained that "*this*" means "Not what thou didst suppose but what I shew thee," or that the coin was under the throne of God. In *Pesikt.* p. 76, one tradition says that the coin is the sacrificial lamb of *Numb. xxviii.* 3.

⁴ Mk xii. 16 foll., Mt. xxii. 18 foll., Lk. xx. 24.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

with Caesar's image and name. But, if so, what is the meaning of "God's" in the following words, "And to God that which is God's"? Does it imply merely this, "If you give the Roman denarius to pay tribute to Caesar, you are equally bound to give the Jewish shekel—that is, the temple shekel, the shekel with its sacred symbols stamped upon it—to God"?

That is, at first sight, an attractive explanation because it is so simple, and lays down so definite a rule. But, on second thoughts, does it seem like Jesus to lay down definite rules (except in hyperbole such as "turning the cheek" and "walking two miles") without regard to motive? Does not Christ's phrase, "that which is God's," imply a heavenly denarius, so to speak, stamped with God's image and name? And what is this stamp but the impress of the Spirit of the divine Love? This love best represents the divine nature in its relation to men. This love God gives to men that they may pay it back to Him, thereby ransoming themselves from selfishness and sin, and making themselves free for a life of sonship toward the Father in heaven and of brotherhood toward His children on earth.

The Jews, in many of their comments on the "ransom of a man's soul," or on other texts that speak of the soul's "ransom," say, or imply, that the ransom is "almsgiving," which they call technically "righteousness¹." Sometimes they are careful to add that such almsgiving must be disinterested, or at all events not ostentatious; but frequently they use unguarded hyperbole, such as that "*a farthing given to a poor man bestows on the giver a vision of the Shechinah,*" and that "I shall behold thy face in righteousness," in the Psalms, means "I shall behold thy face," after the Resurrection, "*because*

¹ Prov. xiii. 8 "The ransom of a man's soul is his riches" is often associated with Exod. xxx. 12—13, and is explained by Rashi as being true "because he *distributes alms*" from his riches.

of alms¹." Against the identification of "righteousness" with "alms"—which resembles the occasional identification of "charity" with "alms" in modern English—Jesus vehemently protested. But He did not deny, and indeed He emphasized, the helpful and purifying influence of singlehearted almsgiving. Alms rightly given on earth (He taught) reproduced themselves in heaven, so that the perishable coin from "the treasure on earth" procured for the giver an eternal "treasure in heaven²."

It is only the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke that speaks thus of this "treasure in heaven." And there the context contains no mention or implication of the negative aspect, "ransoming," but only of the positive aspect, reward. But both aspects are suggested in the Threefold Tradition about the rich young ruler to whom Jesus says "Sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have *treasure in heaven*³." According to Matthew, the man needed to be ransomed from himself. He was so fettered in self-satisfaction that he believed he had fulfilled not only the commands of the Decalogue but also the precept "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself⁴." He seems to have been what the Pastoral

¹ See *Bab. Bathr.* 10 a, and *Tehill.* on Ps. xvii. 15, where Rashi, however, does not thus limit righteousness. Comp. *Hor. Heb.* (on Mt. vi. 1) "They called alms by the name of righteousness," and the passages there alleged to prove this. See also the Heb. of Sir. iii. 30, and xl. 24. In the latter, the editors give an alternative, "*righteousness* (or, *almsgiving*) delivereth above them both."

² Comp. Mt. vi. 20 "treasure up treasures . . .," parall. to Lk. xii. 33 "Make to yourselves purses that wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not." To this Luke (but not Matthew) prefixes "Sell your goods and give alms."

³ Mk x. 21 on which see *Beginning* p. 263. There it is pointed out that Mark may have confused "*deceived himself*," ΗΠΑΘΗCΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ, with "*loved him*," ΗΓΑΠΗCΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ, or that Hebrew confusion may have produced the false impression that Jesus "*loved him*."

⁴ Mt. xix. 19.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Epistles call "a lover of self" as well as "a lover of money¹." If Jesus perceived that he was "in love with himself²," we can understand why He imposed on him a condition that He knew the man would fail to fulfil. Through the failure the man would be at least benefited at once to the extent of having his self-love disturbed. Hereafter, he might attain to the vision of the true love, the denarius of fire, the ransom of the soul.

The "denarius" will come before us again when we discuss the Anointing at Bethany, where Mark—again followed by John, but not by Matthew—mentions "three hundred denarii" as the price of the ointment³. The above-mentioned "denar" of the Jerusalem Targum is also latent in Matthew's description of the *stater*, i.e. "*shekel*," taken by Peter from a fish's mouth in order to satisfy the claims of the collectors of the *didrachm*, i.e. "half-shekel⁴." That narrative, whatever may be the full explanation of its details, adds to the cumulative evidence that metaphors or allegories based upon the payment of coin as a "ransom for the soul" would be prominent in the doctrine of early Evangelists, and that literal statements made about denarii in Mark would be allegorized by John. Such allegorizing is comparatively rare in the Talmud, but frequent in the Midrash and poetic Targums, which may often throw light on the imagery underlying Christ's doctrine. In the present instance, quite apart from its value as an exemplification of Johannine Intervention, John's retention of the Marcan "denarii"—taken with the new Johannine context, which

¹ 2 Tim. iii. 2 φιλαντοι, φιλάργυροι.

² I have not found an instance of ἀγαπᾶν ἑαυτόν though φιλεῖν ἑαυτόν is very common. But Mark might use ἡγάπησεν αὐτόν, "he was in love with himself," to denote an excess of the habit expressed by φιλεῖν.

³ Mk xiv. 5.

⁴ Mt. xvii. 24—27 A.V. "tribute [money]...a piece of money," R.V. "the half-shekel...a shekel," W.H. τὰ δίδραχμα...στατήρα. On this, and on Philo's allegorizing of "the half of the shekel," which LXX calls "the half of the didrachm," see *Notes* 2999 (x).

allows us to regard it as part of a reply to a mystical utterance of Christ about "buying"—appears to accord with the Johanne doctrine that God is Love. Man, God's coin, restamped by the redeeming Son of Man with the divine image that has been wellnigh obliterated by sin, is to present himself wholly, in the Spirit of Sonship, to the Father. This sacrifice, and not the partial and formal sacrifice of almsgiving, constitutes the real and spiritual ransom by which the sinner is redeemed from his lower self¹.

If we reject the view that John gave a mystical application to the Marcan "two hundred denarii," what other view are we prepared to take of his retention of it? Are we to say that he retained it simply because it was in Mark, and because he saw no reason why Matthew and Luke should reject it? In that case, we must suppose him to have argued to this effect: "It is desirable to retain as much of Mark's detail as possible. I do not explain what was Mark's reason for mentioning this precise sum, but I am able to add that it was *not* (as Mark supposes) 'the disciples' that mentioned it. It was only Philip."

This would suggest that Philip's utterances were not held in much account by the Evangelist. But is that so? Philip loves the concrete and substantial, perhaps. When Nathanael argues, in the abstract, that no one can be the Messiah if he is from Nazareth, Philip appeals to the concrete and substantial: "Come"—that is, "come to Jesus"—and "see²." When Jesus speaks spiritually about "seeing" the Father, Philip

¹ At the same time the Fourth Gospel contains evidence shewing that its author felt the metaphors of "ransoming" and "buying" to be inadequate, and desired to supplement them by another metaphor or (x. 6) "proverb," in which the Good Shepherd is described as rescuing His sheep from the Wolf at the cost of His life—yet not by ransoming, but by conquering. See *Son*, Index "Ransom."

² Jn i. 46.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

asks for a substantial object of vision, "Shew us the Father¹." Nevertheless it is to Philip that Providence directs the Greeks to come, saying "We would see Jesus²." And it is Philip's materialistic utterance, "Shew us the Father," that draws forth from Jesus the words "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." The Evangelist seems to suggest that this particular Apostle, even though he did not "see" things like a Rabbi or a Philosopher, was more than once made the instrument of Providence for helping others to "see" things as they are. For that reason (it would seem) Jesus "tempts" him—not for Philip's harm but for the world's good. He was worth "tempting." It was destined that through Philip's reply to Christ's question "*Whence are we to buy?*" the world should be led to reflect on the paradoxical nature of that purchase-money with which the Son of God was to buy for them the unpurchasable Bread³.

¹ Jn xiv. 8. Comp. Exod. xxiv. 10 "and they saw the God of Israel."

² Jn xii. 21.

³ Some may reply "Philip and Andrew are mere *dramatis personae* introduced by the Fourth Evangelist, here as elsewhere, in order to present his own thoughts about Jesus in a dramatic setting." But note what Papias says about the pains that he took to inquire not so much about books as about sayings, and in particular (Euseb. iii. 39. 4) "what had been said by *Andrew* or what by *Peter*, or what by *Philip*, or what by *Thomas*...." Is it not very rash to deny that in the Evangelist's days there were current many things alleged to have been "said by *Andrew*, *Philip*, and *Thomas*," not contained in the Synoptic Gospels, and that he made it part of his business to find a place for them in his Gospel wherever they illustrated the Teaching of Christ? No one disputes that Papias did this. Why should we deny the possibility that the Fourth Evangelist did the same thing?

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 20. "How many loaves have ye? Go [and] see," in Mark¹

These words are in Mark alone. Their omission by Matthew and Luke may be explained by the difficulty of giving them

¹ Mk vi 37—38
(R.V.)

(37) But he answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread (*lit.* loaves), and give them to eat?

(38) And he saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? Go [and] see. And when they knew (*γρόντες*), they say, Five, and two fishes.

Mt. xiv. 16—18
(R.V.)

(16) But Jesus said unto them, They have no need to go away; give ye them to eat.

(17) And they say unto him, We have here but five loaves, and two fishes.

(18) And he said, Bring them hither to me.

Lk. ix. 13—14 a
(R.V.)

(13) But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said, We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; except we should go and buy food for all this people.

(14a) For they were about five thousand men.

Jn vi. 5—9
(R.V.)

(5) Jesus therefore...saith unto Philip, Whence are we to buy bread (*lit.* loaves), that these may eat?

(6) And this he said to(?) prove him; for he himself knew what he would do.

(7) Philip answered him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread (*lit.* loaves) is not sufficient for them, that every one may take a little.

(8) One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him,

(9) There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two fishes: but what are these among so many?

Mk viii. 2 b—5 (R.V.)

they...have nothing to eat:

(3) And if I send them away fasting to their home, they will faint in the way; and some of them are come from far.

(4) And his disciples answered him, Whence shall one be able to fill these men with bread (*lit.* loaves) here in a desert place?

(5) And he asked them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven.

Mt. xv. 32 b—34 (R.V.)

they...have nothing to eat: and I would not send them away fasting, lest haply they faint in the way.

(33) And the disciples say unto him, Whence should we have so many loaves in a desert place, as to fill so great a multitude?

(34) And Jesus saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven, and a few small fishes.

For the purpose of clearness, texts partially given above are repeated here. It will be noted that the six accounts all begin with some words of Jesus about the giving of food, or the need of food,

any sense that seems in harmony with the narrative of a stupendous miracle. They seem to imply that Jesus was at some distance from the little store of food carried by the disciples. Finding them ignorant of its amount He sends them away to ascertain it. "Having ascertained it"¹—for that is what the Greek means—they report "five, and two fishes." All this is very simple. But is it not too simple? Why record it? Matthew and Luke—possibly because it is too simple—do not record it. They represent the disciples as replying at once to Christ's "Give ye them to eat"—without any mention or indication of an interval—that they have only "five loaves and two fishes." In the miracle of the Four Thousand, there is the same absence of interval—"How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven...."

John differs from all the Synoptists in that he does not represent Jesus as saying to the disciples "Give ye them to eat." On the contrary, Jesus says to Philip "Whence are we to buy loaves that these may eat?" It is added "This he said tempting (*or, trying*) him, for he himself knew what he would do." This seems to imply "He knew that, in truth, He did not purpose to buy loaves; He intended to prepare Philip to learn a lesson about *bread that could not be bought*." But on the other hand it might imply "He knew what Philip would say about denarii, and He purposed to teach Philip a lesson about *bread that could indeed be bought*—only for a very different price, the invisible 'denarius' of Redemption." In either case we are made to feel that we must look below the surface for some allusive meaning, indicating the doctrine of sacrifice, that is, of "buying," or "redeeming." Philip is to be taught this by being "*tried*" or "*tempted*." The Evangelist has probably some latent meaning in this mention of "tempting."

for the multitude to "*eat*." But John connects his mention of "loaves that these may eat" with "buying"—as a prospective act for Jesus and the disciples ("are we to buy?").

¹ Mk vi. 38 γνώτες, on which see *Proclam.* p. 268 n.

He never uses the word again. In N.T. it mostly implies the malignity of an adversary—and especially the Adversary called Satan—who tries us that we may fall. And though the Synoptists use it abundantly, and often of Jesus being tempted, they never describe Jesus as tempting others.

These considerations lead us to the story of God's "tempting" Abraham before the sacrifice of Isaac on Mount Moriah—the first Biblical instance of the word "tempt," and the only one in the whole of Genesis¹. We have seen above, in the Johannine description of Jesus as "lifting up his eyes and beholding a great multitude coming to him," an allusion to Abraham seeing the vision of the Seed of the Promise. Here it should be added that the same phrase is applied to the Patriarch when he hospitably entertains the Three, who come to make the Promise². In the Dialogue that follows the Feeding of the Five Thousand in the Fourth Gospel, Jews speak of the Giving of the Manna³; and Jewish Christians in the first century could not but connect the Manna with the Loaves and Fishes, both in comparison and in contrast. Now it was a

¹ Gen. xxii. 1 ἐπειράζεν. The Heb. is נִסָּה, which also occurs in Syr. and Palest. of Jn vi. 6, and in Delitzsch's Hebrew. This must be distinguished from δοκιμάζω, "test," "prove," which mostly = נִסָּה in LXX, but never נִסָּה. There is perhaps a touch of irony when Paul tells the Corinthians—who "seek a *proof* (δοκιμήν)" of the Christ that "speaks in" him—that they had better "*tempt*, or *make trial of*" themselves (2 Cor. xiii. 5) "*Make-trial-of* (πειράζεσθε) yourselves whether ye are in the faith, *prove* (δοκιμάζεσθε) yourselves." Πειράζω, applied to persons in N.T., almost always means trial proceeding from adversaries, and Rev. ii. 2 ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους is hardly an exception. But John perhaps felt that, if he had used δοκιμάζω, as in 1 Jn iv. 1 "*prove* (δοκιμάζεσθε) the spirits whether they be of God," he would have misled his readers. Jesus did not wish to "*prove*" Philip to see "whether" he would answer this or that; He wished to "*tempt*" him, as God "*tempted*" Abraham, as a preparation for a blessing that was to follow.

² Gen. xviii. 2 "He lifted up his eyes, and looked, and lo...."

³ Jn vi. 31 foll.

recognised tradition among the Jews that whatever hospitality Abraham gave to the Three, God gave to the Israelites in the wilderness: "R. Jehudah said in the name of Rab: All that Abraham did for the angels by himself, the Holy One, blessed be He, did for his children by Himself; and what Abraham did for them through a messenger, the Holy One did the same for His children through a messenger¹." What "messenger" is here meant? And is there anything in any of the Gospel narratives of Christ's miracles of feeding that includes something corresponding to Abraham's "messenger"? This will be considered in the next section, in the hope that it may throw some light on the Marcan tradition, at present unexplained, "*Go [and] see.*"

§ 21. "*There is a lad here,*" in John²

In the five Synoptic accounts of feeding it is stated by the disciples, or assumed by Jesus, that the loaves belong to the disciples ("we have no more than," "how many have ye?"). The Fourth Gospel alone, after Christ's question "How shall we buy bread?" and after Philip's reply about the insufficiency of two hundred pennyworth, represents Andrew as saying "There is a *lad* (*paidarion*) here that has five barley loaves and two fishes." About this Chrysostom says, "I think that he [*i.e.* Andrew] did not say this in simple ignorance, but because he had heard the wonders of the prophets and how Elisha worked the sign over the loaves³." The loaves brought to Elisha were an offering from a stranger; and Chrysostom seems

¹ *B. Metzia* 86 b. The context enters into detail, *e.g.* "Abraham's "butter" and "milk" are rewarded with "manna." *Comp. Numb. v.* on *Numb. vii. 48* (Wü. p. 348) sect. 14, repeating the same doctrine of the reward of Abraham's hospitality.

² *Jn vi. 9.*

³ Chrys. on *Jn vi. 9*, referring to *2 K. iv. 42* "And there came a man...and brought the man of God bread of the firstfruits, twenty loaves of barley...."

to assume that the loaves of the "lad" came also from some stranger, that is to say, they did not belong to the disciples or to any "lad" in their service. And this is the natural interpretation of the words in John.

It is not unlikely that John was influenced by the miracle of Elisha and the barley loaves, in conjunction with other causes. But the first cause might be Hebrew corruption. The first Biblical mention of "barley" in LXX arises from a misreading of a word meaning "measure" or "estimation¹." "*Loaves estimated* at two hundred denarii" might be confused with "*loaves of barley* for two hundred denarii." Thus a tradition might arise about the loaves that they were "*loaves of barley*." This might naturally be added to the story, partly in view of Elisha's miraculous multiplication of barley loaves, and partly because "barley loaves" might seem to accord with the time of the year², and also with a symbolic application of Christ's act. But this hypothesis does not explain John's introduction of the word "*lad*," *paidarion*. For that is not used in the story of Elisha³. Moreover *paidarion* occurs nowhere else in N.T. and (with one exception) nowhere in Christian writers of the first century and a half⁴. We are therefore led to ask, outside Greek writings, for something corresponding to the Johannine *paidarion* in Hebrew Scripture, or in Jewish traditions about Scripture.

Now, *paidarion* in LXX regularly corresponds to a Hebrew word frequently rendered in Genesis "lad⁵." And the first Biblical mention of the Hebrew word corresponding to "*lad*"

¹ See *Son* 3420 f—g, quoting Gen. xxvi. 12.

² See § II.

³ 2 K. iv. 43 (A.V.) "his servitor" is explained (Gesen. 1058 a) as Elisha's "chief servant," LXX λειτουργός, superior to παιδάριον.

⁴ Goodspeed gives it as occurring only in *Polyc. Mart.* §§ 6—7, where it refers to two servants of Polycarp, one of whom, under torture, betrays his master's hiding place.

⁵ In A.V., "lad" sing. = נער 17 times in Genesis (but not again till Judg. xvi. 26) and 12 times in 1 Samuel.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

is in the story of Abraham's hospitality to the Three Persons: "And Abraham ran unto the herd and fetched a calf...and gave it unto *the lad*, and he hasted to dress it¹." Here A.V. has "*a young man*," and R.V. "*the servant*." But the exact rendering is "*the lad [in attendance]*," "*the young [servant]*." It might be applied to "the youthful [son of the house]" if the context suited such an application, and accordingly some Jewish authorities interpret it here as Ishmael². The LXX does not here render the word by *paidarion*, but that is its regular rendering of the word³. The "lad" mentioned in the story about Abraham's hospitality appears to be the person contemplated by R. Jehudah in the words above quoted "What Abraham did [for the Three] through a *messenger*, the Holy One did the same for His children through a *messenger*⁴."

The title of "messenger" or "apostle" would seem here to apply to Moses. Through him God gave the manna to Israel; and it has been shewn that Moses and Aaron are called God's "*apostles*" or "*messengers*⁵." It is said about Moses in the cradle, according to our English versions, that the daughter of Pharaoh "saw *the child* and behold *the babe* wept⁶." But the Hebrew text has, for "*babe*," the word regularly corresponding to *paidarion*; and Rashi seems to render it by "*lad*," expressly saying "His voice was deep (*gravis*) like that of a *lad* (*pueri*), not like that of a very little infant (*parvuli infantis*)"—apparently attaching a mystical or prophetic significance to

¹ Gen. xviii. 7 LXX τῷ παιδί.

² So Gen. v. and Rashi (on Gen. xviii. 7), and *Aboth R. Nathan* (on *Aboth* i. 16).

³ Heb. נער=(Tromm.) παιδάριον about 140 times, παιδίον (23), παῖς (14), νεανίσκος (21), νεώτερος (10), νέος (7) etc.

⁴ See p. 84.

⁵ See *Proclam.* p. 392, quoting Jerem. ii. 2 (Targ.) "my two apostles Moses and Aaron in the wilderness."

⁶ Exod. ii. 6 (A.V. and R.V.) "child" = ילד, "babe" = נער, LXX ὁρᾷ παιδίον κλαῖον, merging the two words in one.

the fact that the babe Moses in his cradle (like the babe Herakles in Greek story) was already more than an infant¹.

All this, however, though it may explain John's application of the tradition about the "lad" when it had arisen, does not explain how it arose. If such a "lad" existed, why was the fact omitted by the Synoptists? If there was not, how came John to suppose his existence²? To these questions there is at present no answer based on definite evidence. But there are reasonable (though conjectural) answers—derived from what we know about Mark and John in general, and about these Marcan and Johannine narratives in particular—namely, that John is attempting to explain Mark's "*Go, see.*"

One explanation may be conjecturally given to the following effect: "The disciples had no food of their own at hand. But, as Jesus bade them '*go*' and '*see*,' they '*went*' and '*saw*.' They found some one with five loaves and two fishes. These they brought to Jesus saying that they had no more. In reality, they had not even these. But as the owner was willing to give them, they brought them as their own. All this is obscurely suggested in the Marcan '*Go, see*,' and is altogether omitted by Matthew and Luke. But in fact this stranger with the 'five loaves and two fishes' whom the disciples '*went*' and '*saw*,' may have been a person not to be left out. He may have been

¹ See *Numb. i.* (on *Numb. iii. 14*, Wü. p. 42) quoting *Exod. ii. 6* and *ib. 23* and saying that the "sighing" of Israel and the "weeping" of Moses in the cradle were the preparation of the nation for fulfilling the purpose of God. On *Zech. ii. 4* (8) "*this young man*," Kimchi, who assumes the prophet to be meant, says that he is so called, either as being literally "young" (like Jeremiah) or as being subordinate to a superior as Joshua was to Moses (*Exod. xxxiii. 11* "*Joshua the son of Nun a young man*").

² To a third question, "If there was not, how came John to invent it?" my reply would be that repeated investigations in previous parts of *Diatessarica* have shewn that John does not "invent"—though he may have received visions that some would call "inventions." This tradition may have been one of "the sayings of Andrew" inquired into by Papias (s. above, p. 80, n. 3).

like the stranger in Genesis ('a certain man') who met Joseph wandering in the field and said to him 'What seekest thou¹?' That 'man,' they say, was Gabriel. But Gabriel would not be appropriate here. For in this action the Lord is recompensing to Abraham's children the hospitality that He Himself received from Abraham, in which Abraham was helped, not by a 'man' but by a '*lad*.' Let us say, then, that this unknown stranger was a '*lad*.' And as the '*lad*' assisted Abraham in preparing food for the Lord, so let us now see a '*lad*' assisting the Lord in preparing food for Abraham's descendants. The '*lad*' then received 'a calf' from Abraham and 'prepared' it. The '*lad*' now gives 'five loaves and two fishes' to the Lord Jesus, and He prepares them by letting them pass through His hands as He distributes the food to all the people. This '*lad*' was Moses, who wrote the five books of the Law, containing also songs and predictions². As the five loaves are symbolic of the Law, so the fishes might be symbolic of psalms and prophecies, whether called 'a few,' or, as some might say, 'two fishes,' that is, 'the Psalms and the Prophets' considered as two books. This was the food that Moses, the servant of God, offered to the Messiah, the Son of God, who distributed it to the people. And as Joshua, the first Jesus, is called a

¹ Gen. xxxvii. 15, on which see *Joh. Gr.* 2649 b.

² Jerome, on Mt. xiv. 17, says "In another Evangelist we read (Jn vi. 9) *There is a lad here who has five loaves*—who seems to me to signify Moses." The text continues: "*Duos autem pisces vel utrumque intelligimus Testamentum, vel quia par numerus refertur ad legem.*" But one MS adds "*et prophetas,*" which seems necessary to the sense ("the even number refers to the Law and the Prophets"). Later on he says: "*The Law with the Prophets* is broken and divided into fragments (in frusta discerpitur) and its mysteries are brought forth to view, so that what did not nourish, as long as it was whole and abiding in its pristine state, might, by being divided into parts, nourish the multitude of the Gentiles (gentium)."

Origen, on Mt. xiv. 17, says that "perhaps" the five loaves contained a veiled reference to "the sensible (*αἰσθητοῦς*) words of the Scriptures corresponding in number on this account to the five senses," and the two fishes to the *λόγος προφορικὸς* and the *λόγος*

'lad' when ministering to Moses¹, so is Moses himself called a 'lad' when ministering to the second Jesus."

The second explanation, though similar to the first in detail, would differ in this respect, that it would base itself in part on apostolic tradition. It would go back to one of those "sayings of Andrew" about which Papias tells us that he used to make inquiry, something to this effect:—"Andrew, the Apostle, said (*or*, used to say) that *the Five Loaves and the Two Fishes did not appertain to the Twelve, but to a Servant* [meaning Moses]. Also Andrew said (*or*, used to say)—speaking of the Law and the Prophets in themselves and before they were broken up like bread and expounded by the Lord—'*What could they avail for the multitudes [seeking the Bread of Life]*'²?"

The second of these explanations seems to me decidedly more probable than the first; but if either of them is even partially correct we find ourselves in an atmosphere of

ἐνδιάθετος ("which are a relish, so to speak, to the sensible things contained in the Scriptures") or, perhaps, to the word that had "already come (φθάσαντα)" to the disciples "about the Father and the Son"; but he adds that others may be able to give a fuller and better interpretation.

Clement of Alexandria 665—6, while implying that the "five pillars" of Exod. xxvi. 37 are less sacred than the "four pillars" of Exod. xxvi. 32, simply mentions "the five loaves" in connection with "the things of sense."

Thus, the further back we go, the less proof we find that "five" was regarded by Greek commentators as referring to the five books of the Law. They may be wrong. They may have failed to catch the poetic allusions of the Galilaean tradition. But still we have to keep our minds open to the possibility that "five" may have originally had some other reference (*e.g.* meaning "a few") and that the explanation of the "five loaves" as the five books of the Law came later. It certainly is not entirely satisfactory, because it is difficult to find a corresponding explanation of the "two fishes."

¹ Exod. xxxiii. 11 "His [*i.e.* Moses's] minister Joshua, the son of Nun, a *lad*," R.V. "*a young man*." Perhaps the Heb. word is intended to convey the double notion of youth and service.

² On the ambiguous "said" or "used to say"—ambiguous in Hebrew as well as in Greek (ἐλεγε), see *Joh. Gr.* 2470 a.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Jewish symbolism and mystical tradition through which we must look at the whole of the context. It is easy to realise this about the "two hundred denarii" discussed above. But the reader may feel it absurd that he should be asked to extend this hypothesis to the Marcan phrase "*Go, see!*" to which we now return. These words he may declare to be not only simple in themselves, but also in accord with another Marcan tradition about the disciples as having "forgotten" to bring "loaves with them¹."

But the literal truth of that other tradition itself is very doubtful. It is omitted by Luke. And the Marcan context, saying "Save one loaf, they had not [any loaves] in the boat with them," is omitted by Matthew and is suggestive of metaphor literalised. We ought therefore to give a patient consideration to the suggestion that, in the present passage, "*Go, see!*" may be a Marcan misinterpretation of "*Come and see,*" a phrase used in Jewish tradition to call attention to weighty sayings, especially about the ways of God as superior to those of man. John uses a form of it thrice in passages where it is susceptible of a mystical meaning². Also, in particular, "*See*" is applied to numbers when rabbinically interpreted. For example, *Horae Hebraicae* illustrates the "barley loaves" in John by quoting a fanciful exaggeration about the feeding of the sons of the prophets with "loaves of barley" by Elisha, in which "*See!*" occurs thrice; and the formula is sometimes repeated much more frequently³. Somewhat similarly,

¹ Mk viii. 14, parall. Mt. xvi. 5, om. Lk. xii. 1.

² See Schlatter, on Jn i. 39 "come and ye shall see," referring to *ib.* 46 and xi. 34 and quoting from *Mechilt.* (on Exod. xii. 1, xx. 12) "*Come and see* what God replies to him" and "*Come and see* their reward." See also Wetstein, *Hor. Heb.*, and Schöttgen, on Jn i. 39.

³ *Hor. Heb.* on Jn vi. 9 quoting *Chetub.* 105. 2, 106. 9 on 2 K. iv. 42 "Twenty loaves, and the loaf of the firstfruits, *see*, one and twenty; the green ear, *see*, two and twenty...and so, *see*, there were two thousand and two hundred fed." I substitute "see" for "behold," as Wünsche habitually does, *e.g.* on Numb. vii. 66 foll. p. 372 "*siehe*,

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

in an early Galilaean tradition about the Feeding of the Five Thousand, attention may have been called to the number of the loaves: "*See (or, Go and see) there are five loaves*¹." This was misunderstood by Gentile interpretation (adopted by Mark) as though the first half of the sentence came from Jesus, who said "*Go and see [how many loaves there are]*," and the second half from the disciples, who said "*There are five loaves.*"

It is perhaps worth noting that the phrase "five loaves" occurs in the narrative of an incident in the life of David to which Jesus Himself called attention—the eating of the sacred shewbread by laymen contrary to the Law. All the Gospels mention this. But they do not quote the exact words of David, which are "Give me *five loaves of bread* in mine hand or whatsoever is present²." No other passage in the Bible mentions "*five loaves.*" The meaning appears to be (as the Vulgate renders it) "*even five [if you can give no more].*" "Five" therefore may be regarded as typical of a small number³. In the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Son of David restores and consecrates the "five loaves" that David might be said, in some sort, to have taken away and desecrated. It ought not to be surprising if, apart from other mystical views of the number "five," this allusion in itself caused a Jewish Christian Evangelist to call attention to the coincidence by means of the formula "*Come and see.*" It ought to be less surprising that the formula was misunderstood by Gentiles.

das sind zwei,...*siehe*, das sind vier..." where it occurs seven times. On p. 374 it occurs six times.

¹ The Heb. בוא, which regularly means "come," is frequently used for "go," e.g. Gen. xxxi. 18 R.V. "go," LXX ἀπελθεῖν.

² 1 S. xxi. 3 referred to in Mk ii. 26, Mt. xii. 4, Lk. vi. 4.

³ See Lev. xxvi. 8 "*Five* of you shall chase an hundred," and Is. xxx. 17 "at the rebuke of *five*." The attempt to explain it otherwise (J. *Succa* vi. 8 (Schwab p. 50)) is unsatisfactory.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 22. "*Here*," in all the Gospels

The Johannine phrase discussed in the last section, "*there is a lad*" is followed by "*here*." "*Here*" is also inserted by Matthew as follows:—

Mk vi. 38	Mt. xiv. 17	Lk. ix. 13
They say (D and SS add "to him"), Five...	But they say to him, We have not <i>here</i> save five...	But they said (<i>lit.</i>) There are not to us more than five...

In *Corrections* it was suggested that "*here*" might be added by Matthew for emphasis, or that there might be some confusion between "*here*" and "*bread*" which are very similar in Hebrew¹. The latter suggestion is favoured by a passage in the Psalms where Gesenius accepts an emendation based on this similarity². But of course both causes might be at work. Matthew repeats the Greek "*here*" in the next verse after a verb of motion in words of Jesus that he alone records, "Bring them *here* to me³." Luke also, in a parallel to Mark-Matthew "the place is desert," has "We are *here* in a desert place⁴." Lastly, in the Feeding of the Four Thousand, "*here*" is inserted by Mark who has "Whence shall one be able *here* to satisfy these with loaves in a wilderness⁵?" but omitted by the parallel Matthew, "Whence [can come] to us in a wilderness so many loaves as to satisfy so great a multitude?" The recurrences of the same word meaning "here" or "hither" in the narratives of miraculous feeding suggest the examination of the Biblical use of the word above mentioned, meaning "*hither*" but confusable with "*bread*."

It occurs for the first time in the words of the fugitive Hagar whom "the angel of the Lord found by a fountain of

¹ See *Corrections* 403 (i), where it is also pointed out that "to him" and "not" are often confused in Hebrew (see Gesen. 520 b).

² See Gesen. pp. 240—1 on Ps. lxxiii. 10 adopting לֶחֶם "*bread*" for הֵלֶם "*hither*."

³ Mt. xiv. 18 φέρετέ μοι ὧδε αὐτοὺς, not in parall. Mk-Lk.

⁴ Lk. ix. 12.

⁵ Mk viii. 4.

water in the wilderness of Shur." Hagar exclaims "Have I even *here* looked after him that seeth me¹?" Rashi explains "*even here*" as meaning "*even here in the desert*," and that makes good sense, recognising that God sees everywhere; but the Jerusalem Targums confused the word with an almost identical one meaning "dream" or "vision," and the LXX renders it "face to face²." As a rule, the word means "hither," not "here," and it will be observed that Matthew repeats it (in Greek) in the sense of "hither" on the second occasion.

In the sense of "*here*," it would be appropriate to the disciples, ignorant of their Master's design and saying "*Here [in this lonely place] we have no bread worth mentioning, or we can do nothing for the multitude.*" But, if "*here*" has this meaning, then "*in this lonely place*" is a desirable addition; for, without it, "*here*" might mean simply "*on the spot.*" Accordingly Mark (in the narrative of the Four Thousand) and Luke, who both use "*here*," add "*in a desert, or lonely place*³." Matthew, in the narrative of the Four Thousand, does not follow Mark in inserting "*here*" along with "*in a desert*"; but, in the narrative of the Five Thousand, he inserts "*here*" twice, apparently taking it to mean, not "*here in a lonely place*," but "*here on the spot*";—"We have no bread worth mentioning *here on the spot*," to which Jesus replies "Bring it to me *here on the spot.*" Mark, in the Feeding of the Five Thousand, omits "*here*," but apparently implies, like Matthew, that, if inserted, it would have meant "*on the*

¹ Gen. xvi. 13.

² In Daniel, חלם repeatedly means (Theod.) ἐνύπνιον, (LXX) ὄραμα. In Gen. xvi. 13 Onk. has "I have begun to see" (? confusing חלם with some form of חלל). LXX has ἐνώπιον (? corr. for ἐνυπνιον). In Gen. xvi. 14 LXX has ἐνώπιον again for יחל=vivens. Elsewhere LXX has ἐνταῦθα (4), ὧδε (4), etc. These facts indicate that ancient interpretation did not (as Gesen. does) limit the word to the sense of "*hither*."

³ Mk viii. 4 (the Four Thousand) πόθεν...ὧδε...ἐπ' ἐρημίας; Lk. ix. 12 (the Five Thousand) ὧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν.

spot"; although the disciples had no bread "*on the spot*," they had some a little way off, as to which Jesus sent to inquire how much it was.

Coming to John's phrase "There is a lad *here*" we have to confess at once that, but for all these variations and apparent allusions in the Synoptists, we should take it to mean simply "*on the spot*" or "*at hand*." But if the "*lad*" is to be regarded as the representative of Moses, and if John had before him various traditions likening the Five Thousand in the Desert to Israel in the Wilderness of Sinai, then we shall not reject as improbable the hypothesis that this saying of Andrew about "a lad here," besides having its literal meaning, might also mystically allude to "*Moses in the wilderness*¹."

§ 23. "*By companies*²," "*by ranks*³," in Mark

The Greek for "company," *symposion*, means literally "drinking-party." The Greek for "rank," *prasia*, means perhaps literally "greenery," and in practice a rectangular "garden-bed⁴." Neither of these words is adopted by the

¹ In examining this hypothesis of allusion to the story of Hagar, or of confusion arising from Hebrew corruption, we must not ignore the fact that elsewhere Matthew and Luke appear to insert "hither" simply for emphasis. (See *Corrections* 425 on Mk ix. 19, Mt. xvii. 17, Lk. ix. 41.) And the LXX does sometimes insert it for this reason where it is not in the Hebrew, besides omitting it sometimes where it is in the Hebrew. (See *Corrections* 425 (i) *a* and *b*.) But the recurrence of "here" in these narratives of feeding is rather too frequent to be explained thus.

² Mk vi. 39 συμπόσια συμπόσια.

³ Mk vi. 40 πρασιαὶ πρασιαί.

⁴ Hesych. says that πράσα=τὰ βρῦα κ. τὰ φυκία, and πρασιαί=αἱ ἐν τοῖς κήποις τετράγωνοι λαχαναί. The facts suggest that the word originally denoted "*green*" and was then applied to any very common green vegetable, *e.g.* the leek (comp. in English, "*greens*"). L.S. gives πράσιον="horehound," and πράσον=(1) leek, (2) a leek-like sea-weed. Hesych. suggests πέρας "boundary" as the origin of the word:—οἶον περᾶσαι διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ πέρασι τῶν κήπων. The word πρασιά is frequent in Homer. Field (on Mk vi. 40) shews that the word was *not* (as has been maintained) associated with the thought of "flower-beds" or "parterres" implying variety of colour.

parallel Matthew, Luke, or John¹. The question therefore arises whether John has, or has not, in his context, something that expresses the thought underlying Mark's peculiar expressions. If he has not, this passage will have to be recognised as an instance of the failure of the Rule of Johannine Intervention.

Symposion occurs only once in canonical LXX. There it represents the Hebrew phrase "*drinking-party of wine*²." Philo, it is true, repeatedly uses it in describing the sacred meals of the Therapeutae. But he expressly uses it as a paradox, "*contrasting their symposia with the symposia of other*

1 Mk vi. 39—40 (R.V.)	Mt. xiv. 19 a (R.V.)	Lk. ix. 14—15 (R.V.)	Jn vi. 10 (R.V.)
(39) And he commanded them that all should sit down (<i>lit.</i> recline) by companies upon the green grass.	And he commanded the multitudes to sit down (<i>lit.</i> recline) on the grass.	(14) For they were about five thousand men. And he said unto his disciples, Make them sit down (<i>lit.</i> recline) in companies (<i>κλισίας</i>), about fifty each.	Jesus said, Make the people sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand.
(40) And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties.		(15) And they did so, and made them all sit down (<i>lit.</i> recline).	

In the Feeding of the Four Thousand the reclining is mentioned merely as a command thus:—

Mk viii. 6 a (R.V.)	Mt. xv. 35 (R.V.)
And he commandeth the multitude to sit down on the ground.	And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the ground.

R.V. in these six columns does not represent several differences in the Greek. For example, R.V. "command" = ἐπιτάσσω, κελεύω, and παραγγέλλω.

² Esth. vii. 7 *συμπόσιον* = "*drinking-party* (*מִשְׁתֶּה*) of wine (*יַיִן*)."
Συμπόσιον οἴνου = the same Heb. in Sir. xxxv. (xxxii.) 5, xlix. 1. In Is. i. 22 (Aq.) and Hos. iv. 18 (Sym. and Quint.) *συμπόσιον* represents Heb. סָבָא (Gesen. 685 a) "drink," "liquor," (?) "drunken-revelling." The parallel Lk. ix. 14 has *κλισίας*. *Κλισία*, in literary Greek (Steph. *Thes.*) means a "booth" (comp. 3 Macc. vi. 31, the single instance in LXX). But Luke appears to mean "sitting-place" as in Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 2. 12.

folk," for the Therapeutae, he says, drink nothing but "running water¹." In Mark there is no such contrast. Mark's choice of the word therefore requires explanation. It seems singularly unsuitable in a narrative about feeding with bread and fish where there appears no suggestion, and certainly no mention, of wine, or of anything to drink.

But in fact there is such a suggestion, though a most obscure one, in the Marcan word *prasiai*. For this, though literally meaning only "garden-beds," can be shewn to have practically meant *garden-beds that need irrigation*, that is to say, metaphorically "*drinking*." Aquila assumes this in his rendering of the words "As the hart *thirsteth* (R.V. *panteth*) after the water brooks, so *thirsteth* (R.V. *panteth*) my soul after thee, O God²." Here Aquila uses a verb formed from *prasia*, "garden-bed," to signify "thirsting [like a garden-bed that thirsts for water from heaven]." Ben Sira, too, after representing Wisdom as saying "They that eat me shall yet be hungry and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty," *i.e.* athirst for heavenly knowledge, uses the word *prasia* as follows: "I will water my best garden, and will water abundantly my *garden-bed*³." The thought is of the irrigating trenches of a garden or vineyard, opening their mouths like panting animals, and crying to heaven for water to feed the rows of vegetation. The word occurs in a papyrus of the first century in such a

¹ Philo ii. 477 ἀντιτάξας τὰ τῶν ἄλλων συμπόσια (the word is mentioned about a dozen times in the context). The Therapeutae drink (ib. 477) ὕδωρ ναματιαῖον.

² Ps. xlii. 1, see Gesen. 788, עָרַג, "long for," עֲרוּגָה "garden terrace or bed." Rashi gives various explanations, and says that "Menachem" illustrates from Cant. v. 12 (R.V. 13) where Aq. has *πρᾶσαι*. Aq. also has *πρᾶσιουσθαι* in Joel i. 20 "the beasts of the field *pant* (A.V. *cry*) unto thee," where Jerome says "*like a garden-bed thirsting for rain*. For this is what Aquila means, in one word, saying ἐπρᾶσιώθη."

³ Sir. xxiv. 21, 31 ποτιῶ μου τὸν κήπον, καὶ μεθύσω μου τὴν πρᾶσιάν, where μεθύσω, "I will satisfy as if with wine," harmonizes with a hypothesis connecting *πρᾶσαι* with *συμπόσια*.

context as to shew that it would be naturally connected with irrigation¹.

The Targum on a passage in Ezekiel mentioning what Aquila calls "*garden-beds*" has a slightly different form of the word, meaning "*trenches*," and especially trenches for the irrigation of vines². And the metaphorical name "the vineyard in Jabneh" (some indeed call it no metaphor but a name based on fact) was applied to "the university in that place," the reason being that "the scholars sat *rows* [*and*] *rows* like a vineyard that is planted *rows* [*and*] *rows*³."

These facts, taken together, explain Mark's two peculiar traditions. The original appeared to him to describe the multitude as placed "[*in*] *rows* [*and*] *rows*," meaning either "like vines," or "like vineyard trenches," waiting for water, the living water of the Word⁴. This was at first expressed by *prasiai*. But as this did not convey clearly to Greeks the notion of thirst, Mark prefaced it by *symposia*⁵. Matthew and Luke omitted both these terms:—*symposia*, "drinking-parties," because it might convey the notion of carousing, and *prasiai*, "garden-beds," because it did not convey to them the

¹ *Berlin Urkunde* 530. 27 "The water scarcely gives drink enough for one *row*" *μόλις γὰρ μίαν πρασεὰν (sic) ποτίζει τὸ ὕδωρ*. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 13 *ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν* and iii. 2 *γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα*, also iii. 6 *Ἀπολλῶς ἐπότισεν*, "watered" (after "I planted").

² Ezek. xvii. 7, 10 Heb. עֲרוֹת, A.V. "furrows," R.V. "beds," Aq. *πρασιαί*, Targ. עוֹנִית, which="trenches," see Levy iii. 625 *b* and Levy *Ch.* ii. 205 *b*.

³ *Hov. Heb.* on Mk vi. 40 quoting *Jevamoth* cap. 8. For a similar explanation see *Jev. Berach.* iv. 1 fol. 7 *d*, and elsewhere (Levy ii. 408 *b*). The word for "*rows*" is rare in O.T. (Gesen. 1004 *b*, quite diff. from the one meaning "garden-bed") but freq. in later Heb. (Levy iv. 525—6).

⁴ This is the aspect of "*rows*" that commended itself to Mark. But there is also the military aspect in which the "*rows*" would be regarded as "*files*," see below, § 25.

⁵ See *Clue* 31 shewing that "the correct rendering in a conflation mostly follows the incorrect one."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

suggestion of spiritual thirst, and they did not see any reason for such an out-of-the-way metaphor.

What course does John adopt? In the narrative of the actual miracle, it must be admitted, he says nothing that in the remotest degree implies a *symposium*. But in Christ's comment we are taught that the "loaves" with which the Five Thousand have been "filled" are but types of a "bread from heaven"; then we learn that this "bread" is Christ Himself; then we are told that He—not the bread but Christ Himself—satisfies "*thirst*" at the same time as *hunger*: "He that cometh unto me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never *thirst*¹." Subsequently the epithet "living"—familiar to the Jews as an epithet of running water—is applied to this "bread" as being a source of spiritual life². And thus we are finally led to a new and astonishing revelation of the nature of this new "food" that is to be "bought" by Jesus—namely that it is to be His own "flesh." The literalising Jews ask "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Jesus, in His answer, increases (for literalisers) the impossibility. He abruptly implies that the "flesh" will not be separated from "blood." Thus at last we are brought to the actual mention of the word "*drink*," for which we have been gradually prepared: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and *drink* his blood, ye have no life in yourselves³." This, once mentioned, is reiterated: "He that eateth my flesh and *drinketh* my blood," "My blood is *drink* indeed," "He that eateth my flesh and *drinketh* my blood abideth in me and I in him⁴." Such is the Johannine expansion of the Marcan *symposia*.

It has not been maintained above that *symposia* was a part of Mark's original, or that Matthew and Luke were wrong in omitting it. The question for us has been, not as to Mark's

¹ Jn vi. 35. This is in response to the prayer "Lord, evermore give us this bread."

² Jn vi. 51.

³ Jn vi. 52—3.

⁴ Jn vi. 54—6.

correctness, but as to whether John intervenes in order to bring out some spiritual doctrine latent under Mark's text, even when Mark is incorrect or (as in this case) inappropriate in expression. The result has been to reveal, apparently, not a failure but an instance, of Johannine Intervention. And it is a peculiarly interesting one. For here Mark's error appears to have been a Greek husk, so to speak, containing a kernel of Jewish doctrine. This kernel John has extracted, amplifying the exposition of its doctrine so that it illuminates the whole of his conception of Christ's character and action.

As regards *prasiai*, or "garden-beds," it cannot be conclusively shewn that John has similarly intervened. If he regarded the *prasiai* as the Jewish equivalent of the Gentile *symposia*, he may have decided that he had done enough when he had expounded the doctrine implied for Greeks in the Greek word *symposia*¹.

¹ The thought of *πρασiai* as "rows of vines," thirsting for water, would be very distinct from John's conception of the one Vine. The latter (not "vine-rows" but "vine") may have been in his mind when he writes, as words of Jesus, (vi. 56) "He that...drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him."

If we drink His blood, it follows that, in some sense, He is in us; but how does it follow that we "abide" in Him? An explanation is not given in the doctrine that follows the Feeding, but one is suggested later on, when it is said (Jn xv. 4) that we abide in Christ as branches in the Vine. This means that we are in the Christ-Nature or Vine-Nature, in the Nature that produces the sap and the fruit and that juice of the Vine which is called in Scripture (Gen. xlix. 11) "the blood of grapes." It is *in us*, but we are also *in it* because it is *in us*. This metaphor of the single Vine is more accordant with the ancient Hebrew imagery than is the later Jewish tradition about "vine-rows [and] vine-rows" describing the array of disciples in "the vineyard" of "the university of Jabneh."

§ 24. "On the green grass¹," in Mark

Barely stated, the facts bearing on this Marcan phrase might be summed up as a case of Johannine Intervention thus: "Mark has 'on the *green grass*,' Matthew 'on the *grass*,' Luke no mention of 'grass' at all, John '*There was much grass in the place*'; John obviously intervenes. The Greek *chortos*, 'grass,' mostly means 'hay' in literary Greek, and may have that meaning here. But that does not affect either the fact that Luke omits and John inserts the Marcan *chortos*, or the inference—that it is a case of Johannine Intervention."

All this is true. But if we passed on, content with this, we should pass over a great deal that will be found interesting and illuminative for those who are prepared to recognise truth under metaphor, and to accept guidance toward some parts of the truth from ancient Christian commentaries that must be admitted to be, as to other parts, fanciful and extravagant. Such a comment is that of Jerome (on Matthew): "They are commanded to '*lie down on grass* (or, *hay*) (*foenum*)' and, according to another (alium) Evangelist, '*on the earth*²,' in fifties or hundreds, in order that, after they have trampled (*calcaverint*)³ on their '*flesh*' and all its '*flowers*,' and placed

¹ Mk vi. 39—40 ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλιθῆναι πάντας... ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ, καὶ ἀνέπεσαν... Mt. xiv. 19 κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου, Lk. ix. 14—15 Κατακλίνατε αὐτοὺς κλισίας... καὶ κατέκλιναν ἅπαντας, Jn vi. 10 Ποίησατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν. ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολλὸς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. ἀνέπεσαν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες...

² "On the earth" is not said by any Evangelist here. Did Jerome suppose it to be implied by Luke ("make them lie down")? Luke omits "on the grass." On the Feeding of the Four Thousand Jerome (on Matthew) remarks "*Ibi super foenum discumbunt, hic super terram.*" If Jerome is referring to that we must read here "another [place of the] Evangelist (Mt. xv. 35)."

³ "Trampled," comp. the expostulation in Ezekiel (xxxiv. 18) to the "rams" and "he-goats," which not only eat up the pasture of the weaker cattle but also "tread down" the "residue." What they do in a bad sense, Jerome here supposes to be done in a good sense.

under [their feet] the pleasures of the world as being merely *drying grass* (or, *hay*) (*arens foenum*)¹, they may then ascend through the penitence denoted by 'fifty' to the perfect height denoted by 'a hundred².'"

In his interpretation of "grass," Jerome is here following Origen, who says "I think He bade the multitude *lie down in the grass* by reason of that which is said in Isaiah 'All flesh is grass'—that is to say, place beneath [their feet] '*the flesh*' and subjugate the disposition of '*the flesh*'³."

This passage of Isaiah is quoted also in the Petrine Epistle as contrasting "*flesh*," which is "*as grass*," with the utterance of the everlasting God; and it is alluded to in the Epistle of James⁴. Jesus Himself did not command His disciples to "trample" on "the flowers"; but He bade them "consider the lilies" and ask themselves whether they might not trust their heavenly Father to clothe them, since He "so clothed the *grass* (*chortos*) of the field⁵."

It is important to recognise that this word *chortos*, when connected with a mention of men and not cattle or agriculture, is likely to have a depreciative meaning. Paul uses it to describe a false and flimsy structure (of "*hay*") built by some

¹ Comp. Is. xl. 6—8 "All flesh is grass (*χόρος*), and all the goodness thereof is as the *flower* of the field. . . Surely the people is *grass*. The *grass* withereth (*ἐξηράνθη* = *arens*), the *flower* fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever."

² "Fifty" is mentioned by Mark and Luke, but not by Matthew; "a hundred" is mentioned by Mark alone.

³ Origen (on Mt. xiv. 19) τοὺς ὄχλους ἐκέλευσεν ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐν (*sic*) τῷ χορτῷ . . . τουτέστιν ὑποκάτω ποιῆσαι τὴν σάρκα καὶ ὑποτάξαι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός.

⁴ 1 Pet. i. 24, Jas. i. 10, 11.

⁵ Mt. vi. 30 εἰ δὲ τὸν χορτὸν τοῦ ἀγροῦ . . . Note the difference in Lk. xii. 28 εἰ δὲ ἐν ἀγρῷ τὸν χορτὸν . . . Luke rejects the phrase "grass of the field" used by Matthew and frequent in LXX. He substitutes: "But if [*while it is still*] *in the field* [or, *in a field*] the grass—living (*lit.* existing) to-day and [to be] thrown into the oven to-morrow—is so clothed by God." His object is to shew Greek readers that *χόρος*, in this passage, does *not* have its ordinary meaning "*hay*."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Christians who profess to accept Christ as their "foundation¹." Also in literary Greek the noun *chortos* is regularly used to mean food for beasts, as distinct from corn or wheat that is food for men; and hence the verb *chortazein* is used to mean, not only when applied to cattle "fill with hay (*or*, with fodder)," but also when applied to men, "cram, or stuff, oneself with food," after the manner of swine².

In LXX, *chortos* is represented mainly by two Hebrew words. Both of these signify "herbage," but one signifies more definitely "green grass" and is once rendered by LXX "green³." It seldom has any such opprobrious sense as in literary Greek⁴. In O.T., where A.V. has "*hay*" R.V. has "*grass*" in text or margin⁵; and it is said that people in Palestine do not dry grass as we do for winter fodder, and that there is no evidence that the Hebrews had such a custom⁶.

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 12.

² See Steph. *Thes.* *χόρος*, and add Epictet. ii. 14. 24 "most men value nothing more than *fodder*—for wealth is *fodder*" (comp. *ib.* 29). Epictetus uses *χορράζω* similarly (ii. 16. 43) and once in a passage that resembles a bitter version of a saying of Christ's (i. 9. 19) "You are [as good as] dead. When you are *crammed* (*χορτασθήτε*) for the day, you sit weeping about the [fodder of the] morrow." Ast's two instances in Plato are *Pol.* ii. 372 D, ix. 586 A in which men are likened to "swine," or to creatures "stooping down to dinner-tables," *εἰς τραπέζας [κεκυφότες] βόσκονται χορταζόμενοι καὶ ὀχεύοντες*.

³ See Gesen. 348 *הציר* "green grass, herbage," 793 *עֵיטב* "herb, herbage." *Χόρος* = the former about 12 times, the latter about 25 times (besides other Heb. words much more rarely). In Prov. xxvii. 25, *הציר* = LXX "green [things]" *χλωρῶν*, R.V. "*the hay* (marg. *grass*) is carried and the tender grass sheweth itself."

⁴ The Hebrew "grass" denotes transience but not degradation except in special contexts such as Ps. cvi. 20 "the similitude of an ox that eateth *grass*," on which see *Tehill.* and Rashi *ad loc.*, also *Mechilt.* (on Exod. xiv. 29, Wü. p. 108) and Dan. iv. 25—33 (of Nebuchadnezzar).

⁵ Prov. xxvii. 25, Is. xv. 6, the only instances of "*hay*" in A.V. (O.T.).

⁶ See Hastings' *Dict.* "Hay," which says "The winter is the season

Mark has previously used *chortos* in a sense unprecedented (so far as is known at present) to mean the shooting blade of corn (perhaps taking it to mean the early green shoot of corn which the eye cannot distinguish from grass)¹. Here Mark goes further and inserts "green." Perhaps he wishes to make it clear to his readers that he means, not "hay," but "grass²."

Are we then to infer that in the present passage Mark is simply stating a literal fact in the language of the LXX without any allusion to Hebrew Scripture or Jewish tradition? It would be safer to say that he stated what he believed to be a literal fact and to leave it an open question whether his original had an allusive character. For we are dealing with a Gospel narrative about a miraculous giving of "bread," or literally "loaves"; and it is certainly a coincidence to be noted that, in the LXX, the first mention of "*bread*" (or "*loaf*," *artos*)—"In the sweat of thy face wilt thou eat *bread*"—immediately follows the words, pronounced as a curse, "Thou shalt eat the *grass* (*chortos*) of the field³."

The question was asked by ancient Jewish teachers "Was there really a change in the doom pronounced by God on Adam? If so, how explain it?" The Jerusalem Targums say it was changed because of Adam's piteous expostulation, and Talmudic tradition supports them: "Lord of the world," cried Adam, "shall I and my ass eat out of one crib⁴?" These

of green grass here." The ignorance of this fact might lead to early misunderstandings.

¹ Mk iv. 28.

² Wetstein, on Mt. vi. 30, says that *χόρος* is "hay (*foenum*)," but that here and elsewhere in the Gospels it is used of grass still green, and he quotes Plutarch *Q. N.* p. 25 C *χόρος ὑόμενος, κόπτεται γὰρ οὐ ξηρὸς ἀλλὰ χλωρός*.

³ Gen. iii. 18—19.

⁴ *Pesach.* 118 a, and sim. *Aboth R. Nathan* on *Aboth* i. 1 "Said the Holy One, Blessed be He: 'As thou hast trembled, therefore in the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat *bread*'" (where Rodkinson italicises "*bread*"). See *Son* 3422 a, which quotes the fuller dialogue

traditions are not of the first century. But even in the first century we find Philo making a distinction between the symbolism of "grass" and "green [grass]"¹. This, though perhaps derived from Greek influences, indicates that discussions about "grass," and "fodder," and also about the relation of these to that "bread" which is "the word of God," were likely to be current in the first century, among Jews as well as among Christians². On the whole we may say that there is nothing so absurd as there appears to be at first sight in the hypothesis that "*on the green grass*" in the Marcan narrative had, from the first, a poetic and allusive as well as a literal meaning.

Before passing to the Johannine equivalent (in the phrase "now there was much grass in the place") we must note, as a part of John's consistent treatment of the whole subject, his way of dealing with the verb *chortazein* derived from *chortos* "grass," and meaning "*to fill with grass*." It is applied by all the Synoptists to the multitudes, meaning "they were filled" in the sense of "satisfied³." For this, they have some authority in the LXX, but hardly any except in the Psalms⁴.

in the Targums, where God is regarded not as altering, but as interpreting, "the herb," עֵשֶׂב. This = *χόρτος* seven times in Genesis, beginning with i. 11 βοτάνην (אֵשֶׁב) *χόρτου* (עֵשֶׂב).

¹ Philo i. 48 (on Gen. ii. 4 foll.). "Grass" = *χόρτος*, "green [grass]" = *χλωρόν*.

² *Χόρτος* occurs in early Christian writers (s. Goodspeed) only in Justin's *Dialogue* § 20 *passim* (apart from quotations in *ib.* §§ 34 and 50). There Justin, after saying that God (Gen. ix. 3) gave Noah the right to eat of every animal, represents the Jew as on the point of interrupting him: "And as he was ready to say '*as the herbs of green-vegetation* (*λάχανα χόρτου*)' I anticipated him." This shews that *chortos* was a recognised topic of discussion.

³ Mk vi. 42, Mt. xiv. 20, Lk. ix. 17. Comp. Mk viii. 4—8, Mt. xv. 33—7 (about the Four Thousand).

⁴ The Heb. עָשָׂה meaning "satisfy" or "sate" = (Tromm.) ἐμπλήθω or ἐμπίμπλημι 50 times, and πλήθω 19 times, but χορτάζω only 13 times (Tromm., by error, 12), and, of these 13 instances, 9 are in the Psalms.

It must be admitted that Paul once uses it about himself. And his language might be rendered (somewhat tamely) "I have been initiated into the secret both of *having-my-fill* (*chortazein*) and *hungering*¹." But it is better to regard it as Pauline hyperbole (almost equivalent to "stuffing and starving"). And to most Greeks, unacquainted with the LXX, the Synoptic statement would certainly sound like a reproach—as if it meant that the Five Thousand were "filled like swine" without thanks to the giver and without sense of the nature of the gift². By John the word is thus reproachfully used, not in his own words but (which is more weighty) in the words of Jesus to condemn their unintelligent greediness: "Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves and *were filled* [*like cattle with fodder*]³." The words that follow enjoin "*labour*"—and labour like that of the husbandman, which distinguishes

¹ Philipp. iv. 12 μεμύημαι καὶ χορτάζεσθαι καὶ πεινᾶν. On this, Lightfoot, while admitting that it was originally not applied to men except in a depreciatory sense, adds that "in the later language it has lost this sense...being applied commonly to men and directly opposed to πεινᾶν, e.g. Matth. v. 6. On χορτάζω see Sturz *de Dial. Mac.* p. 200."

But Sturz does not give a single instance where a serious writer of literary Greek, uninfluenced by the Gospels, applies it to men without depreciation. The Synoptic Gospels prove nothing except that they were influenced by the usage of the Psalms. Epictetus always uses it of men in a bad sense and so does Plutarch (ii. 616 A) in the single instance given in the Index. The first ten volumes of the *Oxyrhynchian Papyri* and the first four volumes of the *Berlin Urkunde* do not contain the word in any sense.

² Goodspeed shews that the only Christian instance of χορτάζω up to A.D. 150 is Clem. Rom. § 59 τοὺς πλανωμένους τοῦ λαοῦ σου ἐπιστρέφον, χόρτασον τοὺς πεινῶντας. But this (like Polyc. *Phil.* § 6) alludes to Ezek. xxxiv. 16 πεπλανημένον ἐπιστρέψω...καὶ βοσκήσω, which follows *ib.* 15 "I myself will feed my sheep." This indicates that Clement uses the word metaphorically in a prayer to God to "satisfy" His hungering "sheep."

³ Jn vi. 26. This is Jn's only instance of χορτάζω.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

man from cattle: "Labour not for the food that perisheth, but for the food that abideth unto eternal life¹."

In conclusion, the apparent attitude of the other Evangelists to Mark's peculiar tradition "on the green grass," may be roughly described as follows. Matthew omits "green," possibly regarding it as a mere picturesque epithet. Luke omits the whole phrase, perhaps as being of doubtful meaning, and perhaps because, looking at Mark's picture from a western point of view as an expanse of long grass not yet cut, he thought that five thousand men, lying down on it, would do mischief such as Jesus would not have sanctioned. John, omitting "green," suggests that it may have been "hay," not "grass." Also he suggests the same thing by slightly altering the context. For he does not speak of "*the grass*" as a natural element in the scene (like "*the trees*," "*the forest*," etc.). He suggests that there *happened to be a great quantity of hay lying about in swaths in that district*². If that was, or was supposed to be, the case, it would be an occasion on which Jesus might naturally be supposed to say to the multitude, somewhat as in the Sermon on the Mount, "*consider the grass of the field how God provideth it with clothing*." This, in Hebrew or Aramaic, might be expressed by "*set [your minds] on the grass of the field*." But this is liable to be confused with "*set yourselves on*, i.e. *lie down on*, the grass of the field³."

¹ Jn vi. 27, on which (and on ἐργάζεσθε, meaning agricultural labour) see *Son* 3017, 3421 f. The words accord with the above-mentioned prayer of Adam to God that he might be allowed to work for bread instead of browsing on grass.

² If the Passover was (Jn vi. 4) "at hand," hay-making might naturally be supposed to be going on. Nonnus seems to imply "happened to be" by τις in his paraphrase of Jn vi. 10 ἦν δὲ τις αὐτόθι χόρτος ἀπείριτος. The multitude (he says) took their meal "*on the top of the hay*," ὑψόθι χόρτον. "Each man was leaning as it were against a party-wall all of them reclining in rows," ἕκαστος ἐρείδετο γείτονι τοίχῳ κεκλιμένοι στοιχηδόν. That is, they leaned against the "swaths" covering a widely extended space.

³ See Gesen. p. 963 on Judg. xix. 30 where the Heb. has "*Set ye for yourselves* (לכם) *upon it*" = R.V. "*consider of it*," LXX (Swete) θέσθε

This would give, as the original, a tradition somewhat resembling the spiritual interpretation of Origen and Jerome, but with an important difference. It would be, not "Set yourselves *above*, or *against*, the grass of the field, as if it were an enemy to be conquered," but "Set yourselves [*to think*] *over* it in order to learn the lesson that it teaches¹."

§ 25. "By hundreds and by fifties," in Mark²

Mark is the only one of the Evangelists that mentions "hundreds" in this connection. What he has in view is five thousand men in a hundred parallel rows, each row containing fifty men³. If he had previously mentioned five thousand as

ὑμῖν αὐτοὶ ἐπ' αὐτήν..., Targ. "set your hearts upon it." The Gk varies greatly. Field reads αὐτοῖς. And θέσθε ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐπ' αὐτήν might be supposed to be an error for θέσθε ὑμῶς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ αὐτήν.

¹ Comp. 4 Esdr. ix. 24—27 "Ibis in campum florum, ubi domus non est aedificata, et manduces (*sic*) solummodo de floribus campi. . . . Et sedi ibi in floribus et de herbis agri manducavi. . . in saturitatem. . . et ego discumbebam supra foenum." The meaning is obscure, but it is probable that "*reclining on the hay*" has a metaphorical meaning. The thought in the context (ix. 29—37) does not appear to be Christian. It speaks of the "sowing" of "the Law" in "the wilderness." A receptacle (it says) remains as a rule when its contents perish. But Israel, the receptacle of the Law, perishes while the Law abides. This is (in word at all events) opposed to Jn xii. 24 "except a grain of wheat. . . die, it abideth by itself alone."

² Mk vi. 40	Mt. om.	Lk. ix. 15	Jn vi. 10
καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρᾶ- σιαλ πρᾶσιαί, κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεν- τήκοντα.		καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως καὶ κατέκλιναν ἅπαν- τας.	ἀνέπεσαν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες (οἱ, ἀνέπεσαν οὖν, ἄνδρες) τὸν ἀριθ- μὸν ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι.

In the preceding verse, Luke (ix. 14), after stating the total number himself, has represented Jesus as dictating to His disciples the number *in each group*, κατακλίνετε αὐτοὺς κλισίας ὥσει ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα. The total number is not specified by Mark and Matthew till the conclusion of the narrative (Mk vi. 44, Mt. xiv. 21).

³ "Rows." This is the word suggested by Mark's "garden-borders." But the reader must be prepared to substitute "files" for "rows," if it appears later on that the original contemplated a military arrangement in which each "row" or "file" was composed

the total (as Luke has done) he need not have mentioned "hundreds," for "five thousand [arranged] by fifties" (which, in effect, is what Luke says) implies "fifty hundreds." But Mark has not yet mentioned "five thousand." Moreover he desires his readers to see the multitude in regular array—geometrically, so to speak—in oblong "garden-borders," as has been pointed out above. Hence his peculiar tradition—in effect, "a hundred by fifty."

It is not surprising that Matthew omits the Marcan phrase, for it would interfere with Matthew's addition of "women and children¹." But it is, if not surprising, at least worth considering, that Luke, desiring perhaps to condense Mark, chooses to omit "hundred" rather than "fifty." Is there any indication that he may have been influenced by Jewish traditions about companies of "fifty," in connection with Israel—either Israel in the wilderness receiving the Law of God, or Israel as God's army marshalled for war?

For poetic or prophetic Jewish traditions about companies of fifty we naturally turn to comments on the words of Isaiah about "the judge and the prophet...*the captain of fifty*²." Jerome dilates on the mystical significance of "fifty," in connection with "repentance," "Pentecost," etc. He does this (he says) because the "captain (princeps)" of repentance is Christ, and he quotes the words of the Jews to Jesus "thou

of 50 men. See L. and S. on *σποῖχος*, "esp. of persons standing one behind another," and "of soldiers, a file."

¹ Also it might mean "a hundred at a time and fifty at a time." Comp. 1 K. xviii. 4 "a hundred...and hid them fifty [at a time] (*κατὰ πεντήκοντα*)," or "fifty in one place and fifty in another." See *Sanhedr.* 30 b. Rashi says that there were "two caves." Origen (*Comm. Matth.* xi. 3) says that the ranks were hundreds and fifties "since there are different ranks (*τάγματα*) of those who need the nourishment [that comes] from Jesus, because not all are nourished by equal *logoi* (*τοῖς ἰσοῖς λόγοις*)"—an explanation of which the chief value is that it proves that he considered some explanation of Mark's twofold numbering to be necessary.

² Is. iii. 2—3.

art not yet *fifty years old*," as indicating their refusal to accept Him as their "*captain of fifty*¹." Whence did Jerome receive this explanation of "*captain of fifty*"? Rashi and Ibn Ezra say nothing about it. One of the most poetic treatises of the Talmud says "Do not read '*captain of fifty*,' but '*captain of fifths*².' This is he who knows how to handle matters in the *five sections* of the Law." But it adds another explanation "An interpreter is not appointed over the congregation who is less than *fifty years old*³." This accords with Jerome's above-quoted application of "*captain of fifty*."

Another Jewish tradition, also highly poetic and mystical, after quoting Zechariah and Jeremiah on "The Branch" and adding "This is the Messiah," represents God as saying "I will set up a '*captain over fifty*,' " implying that this "*captain*," too, is the Messiah. Then it numbers the books of the Bible, and the divisions of some of the books, and makes out the total to be "*fifty*." Thus "*captain of fifty*," without any change of "*fifty*" to "*fifths*," is made to mean the same thing as "captain of *fifths*" above, that is, "Master of Scripture⁴."

These Jewish variations of interpretation are partly caused by the fact that, in Hebrew, "*fifty*" is the plural of "*five*" and easily confused with "*five*," and partly by the fact that the word, when used as the plural participle of a verb, means "*arranged in battle array*⁵." A notorious instance of such

¹ In some of these remarks Jerome resembles Origen (on Numb. iv. 3, 47, Lomm. x. 35, 41), but Origen does not there quote Is. iii. 3 (nor Jn viii. 57, perhaps, anywhere).

² "*Fifths*" (Levy ii. 78 b) a name given to the five books of the Pentateuch, and the five books of the Psalms.

³ *Chag.* 14 a.

⁴ *Numb.* r. on Numb. xvi. 35 (Wü. p. 451).

⁵ See Gesen. 332 b. An explanation suggests itself from "quincunx," e.g. Caes. *Bell. Gall.* vii. 73 "*obliquis ordinibus in quincuncem dispositis*." Gesen., however, does not offer this explanation, but suggests doubtfully (1) "Ar. *army*," and (2) "army as composed of *five parts*" (not explaining what the "*five parts*" are). The

confusion occurs in the description of the going forth of Israel from Egypt, "And the children of Israel went up *arranged-in-battle-array* out of the land of Egypt¹." Here R.V. has "armed"; A.V. "harnessed" (i.e. "in armour") in text, but "by five in a rank" in margin; LXX "in the fifth generation"; Aquila "in armour"; Symmachus "hoplites," i.e. "heavy-armed soldiers"; Theodotion "on the fifth day²." Besides these variations, there are others in Jewish tradition. Onkelos adopts "armed," and the second Jerusalem Targum "armed with good works." But the first Targum has "every one with five children." Rashi, who accepts "armed," adds "Others say 'the fifth part,' because four-fifths died in the darkness of Egypt." There are other interpretations of all kinds, some of which take the word as meaning "fifty," or even "five hundred³."

quincunx is so called from its resemblance to the arrangement of the five spots on dice * * *. The Heb. occurs only in Exod. xiii. 18, Josh. i. 14, iv. 12, Judg. vii. 11 (but perhaps it should be read also in Numb. xxxii. 17).

¹ Exod. xiii. 18.

² Exod. xiii. 18, Field agmine instructo, LXX πέμπτη γενεά, Aq. ἐνωπλισμένοι, Symm. ὀπλίται, Theod. πεμπταίζοντες—which Field illustrates from the medical use of τριταίσις and τεταρταίσις, to suffer from a "tertian" or a "quartan" fever. Does Theod. regard the Israelites as being delivered from disease (comp. Deut. xxviii. 60 "the diseases of Egypt")?

Jerome, quoted by Field, defends Aquila's rendering, but says "Licet pro eo quod nos *armati* diximus...*instructi*, sive *muniti*, propter suppellectilem qua Ægyptios spoliaverunt, possit intelligi." He seems to see the difficulty of supposing that the Israelites had "armour" before they took it from the Egyptians who were drowned in the Red Sea (as Josephus says *Ant.* ii. 16. 6).

³ *J. Sabb.* vi. 4 has "with five kinds of arms," *Mechilt.* ad loc. also has this, but adds (2) "ready" or "alert," (3) "one out of five," (4) "one out of fifty," (5) "one out of five hundred." *Pesikt.* (Piska x. Wü. p. 110) gives, as the last of five explanations, "R. Jose said that they went forth 'to five generations (zu fünf Geschlechtern)'"—apparently including great-great-grandparents with the babes descended from them (not, as LXX, "in the fifth generation [from the Coming of Israel into Egypt]").

It is reasonable to suppose that poetic Jewish Christian traditions describing one of Christ's Eucharists, or Common Meals of Thanksgiving, accompanying the Giving of the Word of God, might lay stress (as Philo repeatedly does in describing the meals of the *Therapeutae*) on the order and harmonious regularity pervading the assembly¹, and that this might be expressed in language that alluded to the Going Forth of Israel from Egypt to receive the Bread of the Law, as well as to narratives about the actual giving of bread by Elisha, or about the giving of manna. The language of Paul—like the language of Exodus—often takes a military aspect. Mostly he connects it with the single Christian warrior. But he appears to be thinking of Christians "in the ranks," when he tells the Colossians that, though he is absent from them, he rejoices to call to view the "[soldier-like] order and solid-formation" that characterize them as believers in Christ².

If at one or more of what we may call Christ's camp-meetings He commanded the people to be arranged in groups for the purpose of order, it would be natural that the group should be "fifty" (rather than the Latin military unit of a hundred). This would of course not imply military intention or anything except Jewish custom. But when the story afterwards came to be told in Christian traditions, Greeks would not be able to see any reason for grouping "according to fifty." It might be explained to them that it meant "in military order"—for example, "*according to the pattern of the quincunx*"—and that, as there were five thousand men, and fifty centuries, the division might be indifferently described as into a hundred fifties or fifty centuries. Mark thus inserts both numbers. But to some it might occur that vines also

¹ See Philo ii. 481 "before the lying down (*κατακλίσεως*), standing consecutively, [row by row], in order (*ἐξῆς κατὰ στοίχον ἐν κόσμῳ*)," *ib.* 483 *ἐν αἷς ἐδήλωσα τάξεσι . . . ἐν κόσμῳ*, *ib.* 484 *κατὰ τάξεις ἐν κόσμῳ*.

² Coloss. ii. 5 *τάξιν καὶ στερέωμα*, comp. Philo on *τάξεις* above quoted.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

were habitually planted "*according to the quincunx*," and that groups of that kind (*prasiai* or *symposia*) were better suited to the scene of a Christian love-feast than companies of soldiers. Hence might spring the other details in Mark's version. To Matthew all these detailed illustrations, especially those based on the military meaning of "fifty," would naturally seem doubtful in view of the presence of "women and children" whom he (alone of the Evangelists) adds to the five thousand¹. Luke follows Mark as to the traditional "*fifty*," but appears to regard all the rest of Mark's context as superfluous.

Since Luke does not reject the Marcan "*fifty*" and can hardly be said to reject the Marcan "hundred"—because he virtually implies it by his context—there is no ground for expecting, as to these numerical details, any Johannine Intervention. But it has been pointed out above that John does appear to intervene as to the Marcan *symposia*, so as to emphasize an interpretation of these "companies" alien from military thought. Consistently with this non-military aspect, John also rejects the Mark-Luke numbers of the "companies." We cannot say that he does it for Matthew's reason—because "women and children" are to be added. For John does not mention them. Perhaps he does it because this division of the five thousand into small companies of men—as a Roman army might be divided into centuries under centurions, or a Jewish army into fifties under "captains of fifty"—introduces a kind of intermediate agency between each of the five thousand and the One Lord. This intermediation John dislikes. In his Gospel, Jesus alone distributes the bread to each—as we shall see later on—not through the instrumentality of His disciples, but with His own hands.

¹ Mt. xiv. 21, also xv. 38.

§ 26. "Taking," "blessing," and "looking up to heaven"¹

(1) "Taking" occurs in all the six narratives, with the same Greek verb, and mostly as a participle². Its meaning will depend on the place or person whence the loaves are "taken." If they are on the spot, "taking" would appear to mean a solemn and emblematic taking up in the hands, such as might denote a "taking up," or "offering," to God, or an appropriation of the food to God, as though the breaker of bread said to God in the name of the company "We bless thee for *this*, which we lift up³."

¹ Mk vi. 41
(R.V.)

Mt. xiv. 19
(R.V.)

Lk. ix. 16
(R.V.)

Jn vi. 11
(R.V.)

And he took (λαβών) the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake the loaves; and he gave to the disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided he among them all.

...And he took (λαβών) the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake and gave the loaves to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitudes.

And he took (λαβών) the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed them, and brake; and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude.

Jesus therefore took the loaves; and having given thanks, he distributed to them that were set down; likewise also of the fishes as much as they would.

"Brake" in Mk vi. 41, Lk. ix. 16 is *κατέκλασεν*, see § 27.

In the Four Thousand, as in the Johannine Five Thousand, "give thanks" is substituted for "bless."

Mk viii. 6—7 (R.V.)

Mt. xv. 36 (R.V.)

(6) ...And he took (λαβών) the seven loaves, and having given thanks, he brake, and gave to his disciples, to set before them; and they set them before the multitude.

And he took the seven loaves and the fishes; and he gave thanks and brake, and gave to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitudes.

(7) And they had a few small fishes: and having blessed them, he commanded to set these also before them.

² John in the Five Thousand, and Matthew in the Four Thousand, have *ἔλαβεν*, not *λαβών*.

³ Schöttgen on Mt. xiv. 19 says "*Sumptio ista, quae hic et alibi memoratur, actus est peculiaris patris familias*," and quotes *Sabb. 117 b* *בן* (Goldschmidt "hielt"). But Schlatter on Jn vi. 11

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

The first Biblical instance of "take," in connection with sacrifice, is where God says to Abraham "*Take for me* a heifer," and other creatures, and it is added that Abraham "*took for him* all these...¹." Philo comments on the pregnancy of "*Take for me*," which implies, he says, first, that we have nothing good of our own except that which we "*take*" from God; secondly, that we are to "*take*" it *for Him*, as being the loan or deposit that He has placed with us, for which we must give account². He also comments on the paradox implied in human "giving," since, "strictly speaking, we merely *take* (or, *receive*) but are only popularly said to give³."

In doctrine of this kind there is sometimes difficulty in passing from a Greek translation back to a Hebrew original because the same Hebrew word, as a rule, represents both "take" and "receive⁴." But we find Paul, as well as Philo,

quotes *Siphri* לָטַל on Numb. vii. 6 "Mose nimmt sie (נוטלם)." *Hor. Heb.* (on Mt. xxvi. 26) quotes, from the Passover Service, "He *takes up* the unleavened bread in his hand, and saith, 'We eat this unleavened bread...'...then...*taking* two loaves, he breaks one," and (p. 352, from *Berach.* 51 a) "he *takes up* (נוטל) the cup in both hands, but puts it into his right hand: he *lifts it* from the table a hand's breadth and...fixes his eyes upon it, etc."

Λαβών, or ἔλαβεν, also occurs in the Synoptic and Pauline accounts of the Lord's Supper. Lk. xxii. 17 δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν is exceptional. λαμβάνει occurs in Jn xxi. 13 "Jesus cometh and *taketh* the loaf and giveth to them...."

¹ Gen. xv. 9—10. Λάβε μοι (A.V. and R.V. "take me")....ἔλαβεν δὲ αὐτῷ (A.V. "took unto him," R.V. "took him"). Onkelos has "offer *coram me*," Jer. Targ. "accipe *mihi* oblationes et offer *coram me*."

² Philo i. 487 λάβε, μὴ σεαυτῷ, δανείον δὲ ἢ παρακαταθήκην νομίσας τὸ δοθεῖν.

³ Philo i. 490 κυρίως μὲν λαμβάνομεν, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ διδόναι λεγόμεθα. In *Quaest. ad Genes.* it is said, *ad loc.* "Pro illo *Ferto mihi*, optime dictum est *Accipe mihi*."

⁴ Heb. קָח = λαμβάνω more than 800 times, δέχομαι 26 times. The total number of instances of δέχομαι in *Oxf. Conc.* correctly representing a Heb. original is only 42. The LXX throws too great a burden on λαμβάνω and too little on δέχομαι. Luke alone

inculcating that we have nothing that we did not "*take*," that is, "*receive*," and, in the Acts, reminding the Ephesians of "the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said that it was more blessed to give than to *take*¹." The testimony of these two early writers, when combined with the use of the Greek "*take*" in the Pentateuch and in the Synoptic and Pauline accounts of the Eucharist, makes it probable that "*take*" has a ritual meaning also in the Gospel miracles of feeding, and that the Evangelists regarded its meaning there as akin to its meaning later on in the Last Supper.

Passing to the Fourth Gospel we find that the "*taking*" is the one point—out of the three mentioned at the beginning of this section—in which it verbally agrees with the Synoptists. But, by introducing "a lad" on the spot as "*having*" the loaves and fishes, it introduces a possible difference as to the nature of the "*taking*"—leaving us in doubt whether Jesus receives them as an offering from the "*lad*," or takes them from the "*lad*" as the property of the disciples. There is an indefiniteness here like that in the Feeding of the Seven Disciples who "when they got out upon the land, see a fire of coals there and a fish laid thereon and a loaf²." The "*loaf*" that they "*see*" reminds us of what Elijah "*looked*" at when he "*looked, and behold, there was at his head a cake baken on the coals.*" Elijah is bidden by "*an angel*" to "*arise and eat*³." In the Feeding of the Seven, no "*angel*" is mentioned, but a supernatural origin of the food is clearly indicated; and then the "*taking*" of it

uses δέχομαι in Eucharistic narrative (xxii. 17) δεξάμενος ποτήριον (Mk-Mt. λαβών). Delitzsch renders it by the same word (קָבַל) as he uses to represent the Eucharistic λαμβάνω.

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 7, Acts xx. 35.

² Jn xxi. 9.

³ 1 K. xix. 5 (Heb.) "Behold an angel (LXX 'some one (τις)') touched him, and said unto him, Arise and eat." This Hebrew word "coals" occurs only in 1 K. xix. 6 and Is. vi. 6 of Isaiah's preparation for the work of prophecy (Gesen. 954 a).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

by Jesus is described thus: "Jesus *cometh* and *taketh* the loaf and *giveth* to them—and the fish likewise¹."

It has been shewn above that the "lad" might well correspond to Moses. Now the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, after saying that the Word, or Only Begotten, was full of grace and truth, and that "from his *fulness* we all received," explains the reception thus: "For the Law was given through Moses; the grace and the truth" [of God, whether latent and included in the Law of Israel, or latent and included in the laws of conscience and human nature] "came into being through Jesus Christ²." "The Law" is expressed by the five loaves and the fishes. "Moses" is expressed by "the lad." The "fulness" that brings forth "the grace and the truth" is expressed by that multiplying power of the Saviour which results in food for five thousand souls with a superabundance of what Mark calls "the fulnesses of twelve baskets."

(2) "Blessing" is not used by John, who substitutes "giving thanks," expressed by the Greek *eucharistein*, familiar to us in "Eucharist." One reason for this is indicated by the variations in the versions of Mark and Luke where "blessed *them*" is altered to "blesses *over them*³." Jews regarded food as God's gift, *over* which, or *for* which, men were bound to bless the Giver; but they did not bless the food⁴. On the other

¹ Jn xxi. 13 ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς. The impression left on the reader is that Jesus "comes" to each disciple separately, and "takes" and "gives" the loaf to each separately, and that there is no "breaking." The whole loaf is perhaps regarded as given to each, being miraculously reproduced. *Acts of John* § 8 uses "distributed" or "divided" of a single loaf, thus, τὸν δὲ αὐτοῦ [ἄρτον] εὐλογῶν διεμέριζεν ἡμῖν.

² Jn i. 14—17, on which see *Joh. Gv. Index*.

³ In Mk viii. 7 εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι, Delitzsch omits "*them*," SS has "and *upon them* also *having blessed*," D has εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκέλευσεν παρειθέναι (sic). In Lk. ix. 16 εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς, Delitzsch, D, a, and b have "*blessed upon them*," and SS has "*blessed upon them* (or, *upon it*)."

⁴ Gesen. 139 gives only 1 S. ix. 13 as instance of a priest "blessing"

hand, when God Himself is said for the first time in Scripture to "bless," He blesses the fishes and the birds and bids them "multiply." Also when He blesses "bread," or "fruit," or other articles of food, it signifies that He gives increase as well as wholesomeness¹. Hence in Christ's Feeding of the Multitudes, where loaves and fishes were assumed to be multiplied, it is readily intelligible that some Evangelists would regard the word "blessing" as being used in a special and divine sense, so that it implied multiplying, while others would regard it as meaning the usual "blessing" before a meal in the ordinary way.

One way of avoiding ambiguity would be to substitute "give thanks" for "bless." In the Feeding of the Four Thousand Matthew does this, while Mark has, first, "*gave thanks and brake*" about the loaves, and secondly, "*blessed them* [i.e. *the fishes*]." It is not surprising that John almost entirely avoids the word "bless," as being a technical Jewish term². Origen says that "when men '*bless*' God it stands for '*praising*' or '*thanking*' God³." In Leviticus and elsewhere, where LXX has "*praise*," Aquila has *eucharistia*, or "*thanksgiving*⁴." The latter includes a sense of gratefulness and

a sacrificial meal, and here Rashi says that the Targum has "*over the food*." But Breithaupt points out that in the extant text of the Targum, "*over*" is omitted. See Levy *Ch.* ii. 293, taking פָּרַם as "spread out [the hands]," but Breithaupt takes it as "break."

¹ Gen. i. 22, Exod. xxiii. 25, Deut. vii. 13.

² John uses no form of εὐλογέω except in xii. 13 εὐλογημένος—the cry of the multitude, perhaps regarded as the fickle multitude. Philo (i. 453), quoting Gen. xii. 2 (on which see Rashi), says that εὐλογημένος "is reckoned along with (παραιθμείται) the [vain] opinions and reports of the multitude (ταῖς τῶν πολλῶν δόξαις τε καὶ φήμαις)," but that εὐλογητός is reckoned "along with that which is in truth praiseworthy (τῷ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν εὐλογητῷ)."

³ Origen (Lat.) *Comm. Rom.* ix. 14 (on Rom. xii. 14).

⁴ Lev. vii. 12 "If he offer it for (עַל) a thanksgiving (תודה)," περὶ αἰνέσεως, Aq. ἐπὶ εὐχαριστίας. Εὐχαριστία recurs several times in Aquila, especially in the Psalms. But neither Aquila nor canon. LXX uses εὐχαριστέω.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

spontaneousness, not so manifest in "praise"; and the latter, *eucharistein*, is the term adopted by John in the Feeding of the Five Thousand as a substitute for the Synoptic "bless¹."

(3) "Looking up to heaven" is expressed in the Synoptists by a word that often means "*recovering sight*²." John substitutes "lifting up his eyes³"; but places it, not where the Synoptists do, before the breaking and distribution, but at the outset of the narrative, where Jesus "seeth that a great multitude is coming to him," that is, sees the vision of the coming of the spiritual seed of Abraham which was to constitute the Church. The action, both here and in the two other Johannine instances of it, seems to imply a looking up to heaven, not so much to bring down a blessing as rather to behold, and to exult in, and to fulfil, the glory of God. At the grave of Lazarus, when Jesus "lifted his eyes above," He utters, not prayer but thanks, "Father, I give thanks to thee

¹ "Bless" might be substituted for "give thanks" in translating from Hebrew. The Heb. ירה, "*acknowledge* [God's greatness, glory, kindness, etc.]" is rendered εὐλογέω in Isaiah xii. 1 (LXX) εὐλογῶ σε, κύριε, xxxviii. 19 οἱ ζῶντες εὐλογήσουσίν σε (and in effect a third instance occurs in Is. xxv. 3 εὐλογήσουσίν σε (ירא mistaken for ירה)). The Heb. ירה is given by Delitzsch in Mt. xi. 25, Lk. x. 21 ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, R.V. "I thank (marg. or, praise) thee, O Father," where John would probably have written, as in the words uttered at the grave of Lazarus, (xi. 41) εὐχαριστῶ σοι. In wrestling with death for the sake of Lazarus there was an act of sacrifice which some would have called the subject of prayer rather than of a thankoffering. But Jesus "thanks" God for the power to perform it. In the Johannine Feeding of the Five Thousand, Jesus is regarded not merely as breaking bread and blessing God over it as at a meal, but also as offering up a thankoffering to the Father for giving power to the Son to offer Himself to, and for, the multitude. They do not accept Him; nevertheless Jesus, looking into the future, might see cause for *eucharistia* as in Mt.-Lk. referred to above, "I thank thee, O Father... that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding and didst reveal them unto babes."

² Ἀναβλέπω, used in no other sense by John (ix. 11, 15, 18, comp. Mk viii. 24, x. 51, etc.).

³ Jn vi. 5 ἐπάρας οὖν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς....

that thou hast heard me¹." Before the Last Discourse, though there is prayer, there is also a vision of "the hour" of glory: "Lifting up his eyes to heaven he said, Father, the hour is come. Glorify thy Son that the Son may glorify thee²."

§ 27. "*Breaking in pieces*" or "*breaking*"

We now approach a subject of unusual difficulty and complexity—complicated partly by verbal ambiguities, partly by early Christian custom arising out of Jewish custom, and partly by Christian doctrinal considerations and applications of Hebrew prophecy—the "breaking" of bread in the miracles of Feeding.

In the Feeding of the Five Thousand (but not in that of the Four Thousand) Mark emphasizes this act by using a compound verb that means literally "break down," "snap off," or (metaphorically) "break down in spirit³." But it is apparently used by him to mean "break in pieces." It occurs but once in LXX and is non-existent in Christian writers of the first century and a half. Yet Luke follows Mark in using it here, though it occurs nowhere else in N.T., and though the uncompounded verb is quite frequent (as also is the noun) to denote Christian "breaking of bread." Mark may have desired to shew that this was *not* an ordinary "breaking of bread," but that Jesus broke a loaf into minute parts each one of which was magnified. Luke may have followed Mark for the same reason.

At all events Luke does follow Mark, and this is one of

¹ Jn xi. 41.

² Jn xvii. 1.

³ Mk vi. 41, Lk. ix. 16 κατέκλασεν. The word is not in Goodspeed's Concordances. In LXX, it occurs only in Ezek. xix. 12 (Heb.) "she was *plucked up* in fury," κατεκλάσθη ἐν θυμῷ. It occurs also in Job v. 4 (Symm.) Heb. "*they are crushed* in the gate." Steph. *Thes.* does not give any instance where the word must necessarily be interpreted "break in pieces," but a great number where it has a different meaning.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

several cases where, when Luke agrees with Mark, John appears to disagree, or at all events tacitly dissents. For John omits all mention of any kind of "breaking." By this course he avoids such a question as "Were the fishes broken as well as the loaves?" Mark implies that they were not. For he (and he alone) specially inserts "*the loaves*" after the mention of "*breaking*," and then he (alone) adds "he divided the two fishes to all," apparently implying that, although they were "divided" in the sense of "distributed," the fishes were *not* "broken¹."

It may be suggested that John had also another reason, based on the axiom that the Bread, or the Fish, is to be regarded as One and as diffusing unity among those who partake of it. In accordance with this thought, he (and he alone of the Evangelists) quotes, as a prophecy about the Crucifixion, the precept concerning the Paschal Lamb, "A bone of him shall not be broken²." Later on, in the presence of the Seven Disciples, Jesus "cometh, and taketh the loaf and giveth to them, and the fish likewise"; but no mention is made of "*breaking*³." The hypothesis that John was influenced by a mystical view of the unity of the Eucharistic food is confirmed by what Philo says concerning the dividing, and the reuniting, of the parts of the whole burnt offering which "from one, becomes many, and from many becomes one⁴." It is also favoured by the fact that John

¹ See the next section, where it will appear that Matthew obscures this difference, and Luke omits it altogether. The distinction is also clear in Mk viii. 6—7 *καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν...καὶ εἶχαν ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ* (without any mention of breaking in the case of the fishes)....

² Jn xix. 36 quoting Exod. xii. 46, Numb. ix. 12, comp. 1 Cor. v. 7.

³ Jn xxi. 13. Contrast with this Lk. xxiv. 30—35 "Having taken the loaf he blessed [God] (*εὐλόγησεν*) and having broken [it] he offered [freely] (*ἑπέδιδον*) to them...how he was known by them in the breaking (*τῇ κλάσει*) of the loaf."

⁴ Philo ii. 241. This is preceded (*ib.* 240), and followed, by

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

(alone) tells us that in the parting of Christ's garments by the soldiers, His "coat"—a type of the Church—escaped "rending," and that in the miraculous draught of fishes, the "net"—another type of the Church—"was not rent¹."

That John would have been influenced by motives of this kind is very probable. But it is not probable (according to our experience of his Gospel hitherto) that he would have omitted this ancient tradition of "breaking" if he had not believed it to be either erroneous or, at all events, likely to give a wrong spiritual impression. There are reasons for thinking that confusion arose in early times from various interpretations of Isaiah's precept rendered by our Versions "*Deal* (Heb. *pâras*) thy bread to the hungry²." *Pâras* is nowhere rendered "deal" except in this passage. It means "*break in half*," and here, "*break in half* thy loaf for the hungry³." Ibn Ezra takes it thus. But the Talmud records a tradition that the word ought to be written as *pâras(h)*⁴. Then it might mean "separate"

mentions of εὐχαριστία, e.g. ib. 243 ὅταν βουληθῆς σὴ διανοίᾳ εὐχαριστήσαι θεῷ περὶ γενέσεως κόσμου τὴν εὐχαριστίαν....

¹ Jn xix. 24, xxi. 11 using σχίζω in both cases. Luke in his narrative of the Draught of Fishes says (v. 6) "the nets began to be torn asunder (διεμήσσετο)."

² Is. lviii. 7 פָּרַס (but Targ. פֿרנס "*sustentabis pane tuo*"). Ibn Ezra says "it means here to break a loaf of bread" (and he compares Lam. iv. 4 "no man *breaketh* (פָּרַשׁ not פָּרַס) to them"). Jerome *ad loc.* says "frange... non plures panes sed unum panem." "*Deal*" means "distribute"—but does not give the full Hebrew sense.

Modern emendations and modern suggestions as to what the text of Isaiah originally was, however interesting and valuable they may be, do not concern us when we are endeavouring to approximate to Jewish interpretations of the passage in the first century.

³ Gesen. 828 *a* "break in two," "divide" (of the divided hoof) (Lev. xi. 3 etc.). On Jerem. xvi. 7 "neither shall men *break* [bread] for them (לֶחֶם)," Gesen. suggests לֶחֶם "bread," instead of לֶחֶם.

⁴ *Baba Bathra* 9 *a*, Goldschmidt renders this "forsche nach und dann gib ihm." He adds in a note that many MSS have פָּרַשׁ, but that the Masora on Numb. iv. 7 expressly says that פָּרַס is the right reading. Gesen. 831 gives פָּרַשׁ = "spread out, spread," but פָּרַשׁ

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

or "spread out." In this form it might be applied to the "spreading out" of the hands in blessing, or to the "separation" of Scripture into sections, or to its "explanation" in plain words, or to any technical "separation" in Jewish ritual¹.

The Hebrew *pâras* (used by Delitzsch in Christ's Miracles of Feeding) is particularly appropriate to meals given willingly

"make distinct, declare, New Heb. separate oneself, separate, explain."

¹ The authorities, and even the texts, so differ as to the terms פֶּרַשׁ, פָּרַשׁ, and פָּרַשׁ that it is impossible here to do more than refer to what is said about them by Levy, *Levy Ch. sub voc.*, by Hor. Heb. on *κλάσας* in the Gospels, and by Schöttgen in the Gospels and on 2 Tim. ii. 15). Wetstein says practically nothing. The Targumists avoid פֶּרַשׁ in Is. lviii. 7, and פָּרַשׁ in Lam. iv. 4, but they retain פֶּרַשׁ in Jerem. xvi. 7 "Neither shall men *break* [bread] for them in mourning," A.V. "*tear* [themselves] for them in mourning."

On this last passage Rashi has a note obscure, but most instructive, indicating the possibility of confusing פֶּרַשׁ in Heb. "breaking a loaf in half" with some technical use of פֶּרַשׁ in Aramaic, perhaps "spreading out the hands," referring to a benediction. He says that *pâras*, in Jeremiah, "significat fractionem" as in Dan. v. 25, 28 "*u-pharsin*," i.e. "*and divided*" (*pharsin* being a form of *pâras*). Then he adds "For with food did they refresh the mourners in the street, and they did *spread out for them that Benediction* [which is called] 'He that bringeth forth' (etisque explicabant benedictionem illam, הַמּוֹצִיא)." This refers to the words of the Benediction pronounced by the father of the family, or the principal Rabbi, over the breaking of bread at a meal: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, Lord of the world, 'Thou that bringest forth [food from the earth].'"

Rashi proceeds, "Jonathan istud: 'nam ipse יִבְרַךְ,' id est, 'benedicet convivio,' Chaldaice vertit 'nam ipse פָּרַשׁ,' id est, 'frangit cibum.'" This mention of "Jonathan" refers to the Targum of "Jonathan" on 1 S. ix. 13 "he [*i.e.* Samuel] *doth bless* (יִבְרַךְ) the sacrifice," where the Targum has (lit.) "*doth break* (פָּרַשׁ) the food," which Rashi renders freely "benedicit super cibum, id est, benedictionem facit super cibo." "Bless [God] *over* (or break [? bread] *over*) the sacrifice," would be more regular; but Breithaupt rejects the insertion of "over" as erroneous. These passages establish the conclusion that the Hebrew "*bless*," in connection with food, might be expressed in Aramaic by a word that in Hebrew means "*break*."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

out of a small store to the hungry. There is another word mostly used in New Hebrew for the literal breaking of bread; but that, in the Bible, has a bad sense¹. The Talmud uses *pâras* to remind a master of a house that, at a meal in his house, he must not "pronounce the benediction" (*lit.* "divide the dividing") for "travellers," his guests, unless he eats with them, but he may do it for his family in order to accustom them to the fulfilment of the precept². Another passage—but one of doubtful meaning—uses the word *pâras* concerning a distribution of fishes to the citizens of Jerusalem³.

There is no clear indication in the Gospels that the "breaking (*pâras*)" of bread by Jesus was connected with the thought of the "explanation (*pârash*)" of the Law⁴. It is true that the Lucan narrative of the manifestation of Jesus "in the *breaking of the bread*," at Emmaus, at all events prepares the way for that manifestation by a mention of His "*interpretation*" of the sayings in the Scriptures concerning the Messiah, which is

¹ See Levy i. 251 *b* on כָּצַע which, as a Heb. verb, means (Gesen. 130) "cut off, break off, *gain by violence*," and, as a noun, "*gain made by violence*." That is the word used by Delitzsch about breaking bread in the narratives of the Eucharist, though he uses פָּרַס in the miracles of feeding.

² See Levy *Ch.* ii. 294 *a* quoting *R. haschana* 29*b*, and adding, as a common phrase, "the time needed to eat a פָּרַס, i.e. *half* [of a loaf]."

³ *Sanhedr.* 49 *a*, on 1 Chr. xi. 8, Joab "merely tasted" them and then "*distributed* (פָּרַס) to them." This suggests that, in the Feeding of the Five Thousand, "*breaking*," which John omits, might have been regarded by him as an error for "*distributing*," which he inserts. The food is called by Goldschmidt "*Fischtunke* (*sic*) (פִּשְׁתִּינִי) und kleine Fische (צֶהֱנָתָא)." But the latter (Gesen. 850 *a*, and Levy *Ch.* ii. 320 *a*) would seem to mean stinking fish. Hence the interpretation is doubtful. "Joab" is the distributor, and there may be irony in the description of him as attempting to feed Jerusalem with "fishes" not only "stinking," but also broken in pieces.

⁴ Onkelos uses פָּרַשׁ in Deut. i. 5 (R.V.) "Moses began to *declare* this law," where Heb. בָּאֵר (Gesen. 91) = "make plain," "explain."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

subsequently called His "*opening* of the Scriptures," and the result is that "their eyes were opened and they knew him¹." But such a scriptural "*opening*" is connected with a word that means the opening of a door, rather than the opening or spreading out of the hand. It is frequently called "*opening* [with] an opening," and in that form occurs repeatedly in the Talmud where a Rabbi "*opens*" his discussion of some passage of Scripture by quoting another². Nevertheless Luke helps us to perceive a very real sense in which it may be maintained that beneath the narratives of miraculous feeding, and of Christ's meals with disciples before and after the Resurrection, there was originally and historically (whether we easily perceive it or not) a connection between the "*breaking*" of the bread of the Law, and the "*opening*," or "*spreading out*," of

¹ Lk. xxiv. 27 διερμήνευσεν, comp. ib. 32 δὴνοίγειν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς. In LXX, פָּרַשׁ = ἀνοίγω in Is. xxxvii. 14, describing a literal "*spreading out*" of a letter before the Lord, and = διανοίγω in Prov. xxxi. 20 "she *spreadeth out* (A.V. stretcheth out) her hand (*lit.* palm) to the poor." The contextual repetition of διανοίγω in Lk. xxiv. 31 διηνοιχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί suggests a kind of play on the thought of "*opening*." It is repeated again, after Jesus has partaken of the broiled fish, in Lk. xxiv. 45 "then he *opened* (διήνοίξεν) their mind." Διανοίγω occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in Mk vii. 34 "Be thou *opened*," Lk. ii. 23 (quoting Exod. xiii. 2 "that *openeth* the womb"), Acts vii. 56 "the heavens *opened*," xvi. 14 "whose heart the Lord *opened*," xvii. 3 "reasoned with them from the scriptures, *opening* and alleging that it behoved the Christ to suffer."

² Comp. Megill. 10 b "R. Jonathan *opened the opening* (פתח לה פתחה) for this section (פרשתא, from פָּרַשׁ, *separate*) from the following [text]"—a phrase repeated about a dozen times in 10 b—11. Delitzsch uses פתח in Lk. xxiv. 32 and Acts xvii. 3 "Paul...reasoned with them from the scriptures, *opening* and alleging that it behoved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead...." *Hor. Heb.*, Wetstein, and Schöttgen are silent as to any Hebrew authority for this use of "*opening*," and no satisfactory Greek authority is alleged. It might mean "*opening*" the discussion of, for example, the "*section*" in Isaiah about the Suffering Servant by quoting such passages as Hos. vi. 2 "After two days he will revive us."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the meaning of the Law, and the "opening" of the minds of the disciples to that meaning, and, at the same time, the "opening" of their hearts to the divine character of their Master and Saviour, the Bread of Life. We may illustrate this connection from a Talmudic passage that speaks of the material "breaking" of bread (*bâtsa* as distinguished from Isaiah's *pâras*) and defines its spiritual object: "The Master of the House *breaks* [*the bread*] that he may *break it* with a good eye¹."

Now it was one of Christ's fundamental doctrines that the "eye" of His disciples must not be "evil," but must be "single," i.e. straightforwardly and lovingly fixed on God, and on Man regarded as in God, being made in God's image. It was to be an "eye" of kindness and goodness, recognising as the two great commandments of the Law, the love of God and the love of the neighbour. These two precepts, taken up and expressed in the Psalms and the Prophets, might be regarded as the relish, or flavour, of the Law, which, without them, was what we should call "dry bread." In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus might be described as taking and breaking the dry bread of the five loaves of the Law, and flavouring it, so to speak, with the *opson* of these two fishes, and distributing it to the multitudes².

It would be a fanciful but brief and not inaccurate summary of many of the charges brought by Jesus against the formalists who in His days constituted the majority of

¹ *Berach.* 46 a, a tradition of R. Jochanan in the name of Simeon ben Jochai.

² Some "breaking," or "spreading out," or "interpretation," of the Law in this sense would be included in Mark's (vi. 34) statement that Jesus "taught" the Five Thousand "many things" before feeding them with the five loaves and the two fishes. Not much importance can be attached to the traditions in *Sabb.* 116 a and *Gen. r.* (on Gen. xxvi. 17, Wü. p. 307) where it is said by Samuel Bar Nachman and by Ben Kaphra that there are seven books of the Law (see contexts).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the Pharisees, to take as our text Isaiah's ancient word, in its ancient Hebrew meaning, and to say that they modernised it by their Jewish traditions. They thought of it as inculcating the religious duty of "*spreading out*" the hands in prayer to God in heaven; but Jesus thought of it as inculcating the duty—moral and spiritual rather than religious—of "*breaking one's loaf in half*," even our single loaf, in order to give it to the spiritually, as well as the materially, "hungry."

Returning to the Fourth Gospel we may say that a great deal of evidence converges to the conclusion that John's omission of the "breaking" was due in part to various and perplexing inferences as to the nature and results of the act, though in part also to a Johannine motive, namely, the desire to avoid everything that could give rise to the notion that Christ was so "divided" as not to be always One¹.

§ 28. "*And the two fishes he divided among [them] all,*"
*in Mark*²

Mark, in both his narratives, makes a distinction, not made by Matthew or Luke, between the loaves and the fishes.

¹ Comp. 1 Cor. i. 13 "Is Christ divided (μεμέρισται)?"

² In the accounts of the Distribution, Mark (four times) and Luke use παρατίθημι of the food "set before" the multitude, Matthew never uses it except previously about (xiii. 24, 31) "*parables*" which Jesus "*set before*" the disciples. John here uses ὑψάριον instead of ἰχθύς for "fish."

The R.V. does not express all the shades of difference which will be found in the Greek text printed below :

(The Five Thousand)

Mk vi. 41

καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς
πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς
δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέ-
ψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέ-
κλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους
καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθη-
ταῖς ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν
αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο
ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶ-
σιν.

Mt. xiv. 19

καὶ... λαβὼν τοὺς
πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς
δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέ-
ψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας
ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς
τοὺς ἄρτους οἱ δὲ
μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.

Lk. ix. 16

λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς
πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς
δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέ-
ψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ
κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου
τοῖς μαθηταῖς παρα-
θεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.

Jn vi. 11

ἔλαβεν οὖν τοῖς
ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ
εὐχαριστήσας διέδω-
κεν τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις,
ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν
ὐψαρίων ὅσον ἤθελον.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

In the Five Thousand, he says that Jesus (not the disciples) "divided" the fishes. In the Four Thousand, he seems to introduce the fishes as a kind of after-thought or addition ("that they were to set *these, too*, before [the multitude]").

Moreover Mark distinguishes between "setting-before" and "dividing." "Set-before" he uses four times, and always of the action of the disciples. Jesus Himself is described by Mark as (1) "giving" to the disciples, and as (2) ordering the disciples to "set before" the people. These clauses contain no difficulty. But there is difficulty in "he divided the two fishes to all." Perhaps we may explain it from the precedent of David, who

(The Four Thousand)

Mk viii. 6—7

καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ. καὶ εἶχαν ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι.

Mt. xv. 36

ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.

In Mk vi. 41, SS and Walton Syr. have "*they divided*" (for "*he divided*"), and in Mk viii. 7, codex **N** has *prima manu* παρέθηκεν, corrected into εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι. These variations do not appear in Swete (ed. 1898).

The Diatessaron, in the Four Thousand, omits the whole of Mk viii. 7 "*and they had a few little fishes; and having blessed them he said [to them] that they should set these also before [the multitude]*"—except "a few little fishes," which it places earlier (as Matthew does). Thus it omits one of the Marcan mentions of παρατίθημι. On the other hand, in the Five Thousand, it mentions παρατίθημι twice (where Mark has it only once) thus: "Then Jesus said unto them, 'Bring hither those five loaves and the two fishes.' And when they brought him that, Jesus took the bread and the fish, and looked to heaven, and blessed and divided"—substituting "dividing" for "breaking-in-pieces" (κατέκλασεν) or "breaking" (κλάσας)—"and gave to the disciples to *set before them*; and the disciples *set for the multitudes* the bread and the fish." This last clause ("set...fish") appears to come from Mk viii. 6 b "*and they set [them] before the multitude*," and to be a substitute for Mk vi. 41 b "*and the two fishes he divided unto all*."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"divided to every man of Israel" food specified in the context¹. It is not meant that David himself "set the food before" Israel, but that he specified the portion to be "divided" to each and caused it to be set before each. In Mark, the meaning may be that, whereas the loaves were broken and set before the people, "*the two fishes*" were not "broken," but "*divided to all*," that is, "*distributed to all, the two fishes being given to each person*." This miraculous reproduction of the two fishes for each person Mark may intend to describe as a separate act of Jesus.

In the Four Thousand, the fishes are called "little" and "few"—terms that might easily be interchanged². Also the number "two" is dropped, so that any suggestion of "two for each person" is avoided, and we may suppose them to have been multiplied not in pairs but indefinitely by Jesus who commanded that the disciples should set an indefinite number of them before the people. This hypothesis would help us to see why Mark here calls them "little-fishes"—a word not elsewhere used in N.T. or LXX. It might also explain John's peculiar addition "and of the fishes *as much as they desired*"—that is, they were not restricted to "*the two*"³.

But there is another way of explaining this Greek diminutive, as well as the use of "two." We find corresponding peculiarities in the LXX where the widow in Zarephath says to Elijah "I have...but an handful of meal...and, behold, I am gathering *two sticks*...that I may...dress it and die⁴." "*Two*"

¹ 2 S. vi. 19 καὶ διεμέρισεν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ..., 1 Chr. xvi. 3 καὶ διεμέρισεν παντὶ ἀνδρὶ Ἰσραὴλ...

² In Mt. xv. 34, SS and Curet. have different words for "few" (Burk. "a few fishes," Walton "aliquot pisces minutos"), and in Mk viii. 7, Burk. and Walton have "a few fishes."

³ Some reasons for John's preference of ὀψάριον to ἰχθύς here are given in *Proclam.* p. 86. Also, if John had used ἰχθύς, he would have seemed to prefer it to ἰχθύδιον. As it is, he puts both the Synoptic terms aside, introducing one of his own.

⁴ 1 K. xvii. 12 "two (שנים) sticks (עצים)," δύο ξυλάρια. This is

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

is here uniquely used in O.T. for "*a very few*¹." The Greek translators, feeling in a confused way that scantiness—not small number—is implied by "*two*," and yet not liking to suppress the literal meaning, compromise by rendering the Hebrew "*sticks*" into a Greek diminutive ("*two little-sticks*") nowhere else found in LXX.

Mark seems to have done something of the same kind but not so accurately as the LXX. In the Five Thousand he takes "*two*" literally, and explains it as the literal answer to a question of Jesus "*How many loaves have ye?*" They answer "*five, and two fishes*," though nothing was asked about the fishes². In the Four Thousand, writing in his own person, Mark does not venture to say "*They had two fishes*." This would have been as inappropriate as it would have been for the narrator of the story of the Widow to write in his own person that "*she was gathering two sticks*." Such hyperbole, allowable in a complainant, is not allowable in a historian. So Mark paraphrases "*two*" by "*a few*." Yet he might well feel that this was unsatisfactory. "*A few fish*" might naturally mean more, not less, than "*two fish*," and thus the wonder of the miracle would be impaired. So Mark compromises by changing "*fishes*" into "*little fishes*."

John shews us dramatically how the "*two*" and the "*five*" might have originated in the expostulation of a single disciple like Andrew, who exclaims "*There is a lad here with five*"

the only instance of ξυλάριον in LXX, but πν = ξύλον nearly 250 times. The translators felt that "*two*," like "*handful*," implied some kind of minuteness, and this they expressed by the diminutive ξυλάρια while retaining "*two*."

¹ Gesen. 1041 *a* gives no other instance but this where "*two*" is thus used (without the juxtaposition of "*three*" (or "*one*") as in "*two or three*").

² Matthew and Luke go back more closely to the original by representing the "*five*" and the "*two*" to be part of a remonstrance on the part of the disciples, somewhat like that of the widow of Zarephath.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

barley loaves and *two opsaria*; but what are these among so many?" It should be noted that John never mentions the fishes as "two" when writing in his own person, as the Synoptists do. He mentions "the five barley loaves" thus¹, but not "the two fishes."

As to the Synoptic distinction—expressed in various ways—between the giving by Christ to the disciples, and the giving by the disciples to the multitudes, John puts this aside. He represents Jesus as Himself "distributing"—like David, who in an instance above mentioned², is said to have "distributed" to all Israel³. John rejects the Synoptic word "*set-before* [the people]" although it is associated in LXX with the thought of Abraham "setting before" the Three his hospitable food⁴, a hospitality for which (according to Jewish tradition) requital was made by God, in every detail, to Abraham's descendants.

Lastly—when describing Jesus as "distributing"—John does not use Mark's word "divide." Perhaps he felt that, for Greeks, it might suggest the thought of "divided in dissension," as when Paul says to the Corinthians "Is Christ *divided*⁵?" At

¹ Jn vi. 13.

² See above, pp. 127–8.

³ Mk vi. 41, Lk. ix. 16 ἐδίδου (Mt. xiv. 19 ἔδωκεν) τοῖς μαθηταῖς followed by Mk *ib.* ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν, compared with Jn vi. 11 διέδωκεν τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις, may be illustrated by Gen. xlix. 27 קָלַחַ (Field) "dividet, LXX δίδωσι (potior scriptura διαδώσει), Ἀγ. μερίσει." This exhibits the same three variations that we find in N.T. (1) "give (δίδωμι)," (2) "give separately (διαδίδωμι)," (3) "divide (μερίζω)."

⁴ Gen. xviii. 8 παρέθηκεν. There it = Heb. "gave before their faces." In Exod. xix. 7 παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς πάντας τοὺς λόγους (and *ib.* xxi. 1), it=Heb. "set before their faces." See Gesen. 817 *b* which says that both "give" and "set" are thus used of food, but that "give before the face" usually means "propound," and is applied to laws. Matthew (see above, p. 126, n. 2) uses παρατίθημι only about parables.

Comp. 2 K. iv. 43 "Am I to *set this before* an hundred men?"—which is the exclamation of Elisha's servant—and *ib.* 44 "so he *set it before them*." John passes over this intermediate act of service.

⁵ 1 Cor. i. 13 μερίζεται ὁ Χριστός; Μερίζω denotes "divided by conflict" in Mk iii. 24 etc.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

all events he chooses an ambiguous word that may mean either (1) "give in turn what one has received" or (2) "give to separate persons¹." The word is hardly used in LXX, but may very well represent the Hebrew "*apportion*," while at the same time the Greek reader receives from it the suggestion that the Son is here giving in turn to men something that He has Himself received from the Father. This is confirmed by Christ's subsequent words "My Father *giveth you the true bread out of heaven*" and "*I am the bread of life*"—when taken with a previous utterance "As the Father hath life in himself, even so *gave he to the Son* also to have life in himself²." The Son, giving Himself utterly to the Giver of eternal life, the Father in heaven, receives from Him power to become the Bread of Life for the Father's children on earth.

In connection with the multiplication of the fishes, the following facts indicate that it might have a Messianic allusiveness in the Galilæan Church. The New Hebrew and Aramaic for "fish," *nun*, though non-existent in the Bible as a noun, occurs once as a verb (*yinnon* or *jinnon*), meaning literally "*shall abound with offspring*," thus, "His name *shall-abound-with-offspring* (Field *sobolescet*, Walton *filiabitur*) before the sun³." On the Hebrew "*shall abound*," *Jinnon*, Schöttgen says "It means 'shall be multiplied like fishes.' But the

¹ Διαδίδωμι (= Heb. word) occurs only in Gen. xlix. 20, 27 (A), and Josh. xiii. 6 (LXX). In Genesis it = נתן and חלק, and B has (*bis*) διδωμι. For διαδίδωμι = "give in succession" see Steph. Thes. ii. 1139. Goodspeed gives διαδίδωμι only in Hermas Sim. v. 2. 9 where the faithful servant, having received ἐδέσματα from his Master, "distributes" some of them to his fellow-servants.

² Jn vi. 32, 35, v. 26.

³ Ps. lxxii. 17 R.V. txt "*shall be continued*," marg. "*shall have issue*." The Biblical Heb. for "fish" is דג (Aram. נין). The verb דג occurs but once (Gesen. 185 b), Gen. xlviii. 16 R.V. "*grow-into-a-multitude*," where A.V. marg. says "(Heb.) *as fishes do increase*," and Onkelos has "increase like the fishes (נוני) of the sea."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Jews took it as a *proper name*¹." This, though over-stated, is confirmed by several passages in Midrash and Talmud, which indicate that in poetic traditions the Jews regarded *Jinnon*, in this Psalm, as one of the names of the Messiah existent before the Creation². Now the preceding verse says "There shall be *abundance* (marg. *an handful*) of corn in the earth on the top of the mountains³"; and on the word rendered "abundance" Rashi says "Our rabbis expound it as meaning *cakes in the days of the Messiah, and the whole of this Psalm they explain as being about the King Messiah*⁴."

The Jewish Commentary on the Psalms quotes a tradition of this kind as going back to R. Jochanan: "The land of Israel will *bring forth little round cakes*⁵." The commentary does not quote any corresponding tradition about "*Jinnon*," that the waters of Israel "will bring forth a multitude of little fishes," or that the Messiah "will multiply fishes." But it is not difficult to see that such a tradition would be likely to find favour in the first century among the Jews and especially among the fishermen and others who dwelt round the sea of Galilee. The commentary on Numbers called *Siphri* says "There went with Israel in the wilderness a well, and supplied fat fishes more than their need required⁶." The "well" was believed to flow from a "rock" that "followed" Israel; and

¹ Schöttgen ii. 20. This is not universally true, for the Targum has "*was prepared* before the sun," perhaps (like the LXX) having a different reading; and Rashi takes it as meaning "kingdom" and "empire." Gesen. 630 *b* suggests that the original may have been יָכֹן "*be established, endure,*" LXX has διαμενεί.

² See Levy ii. 246 *a* quoting three passages, and Schöttg. ii. 240 quoting others.

³ Ps. lxxii. 16, see Gesen. 821 *a*.

⁴ Rashi himself explains the word as meaning either "*additionem et multitudinem*" or "*beneplacitum.*"

⁵ *Tehill.* ad loc. mentions R. Chija bar Asi as uttering it "in the name of R. Jochanan" (who lived in the time of Vespasian).

⁶ *Siphri* on Numb. xi. 22.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

according to Paul, "the rock was Christ¹." In proportion as Christianity advanced, such traditions about "fishes," or "loaves," or "round cakes" of the Messiah, would fall into disrepute among the Jews, as having a Christian sound. I have not found Jochanan's tradition quoted elsewhere, although many passages in Midrash and Talmud refer to the verse in the Psalms. But, if it was avoided because of its resemblance to Christian traditions, the same motive may explain the silence of Jewish tradition about multiplication of fishes in Messianic times².

¹ 1 Cor. x. 4.

² In view of the very early use of the Greek *ichthus*, "fish," to denote by means of the letters *i, ch, th, u, s*, "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour (or, Crucified)"—see *Orac. Sibyll.* viii. 217 foll.—it may be of interest to note the very different use made by the Jews of *n*, the initial letter of "*nun*," "fish." They called attention to the fact that *n* and the two next letters of the alphabet (נ, ד, ע) were initial letters of (1) נון "fish," (2) דמא "remedy," (3) עין "eye," thus indicating that "fish" was a "remedy" for the "eye" (as it is in Tobit xi. 4—11).

Also the Jewish dependence on fish for a sumptuous meal in which they were to "*honour*" the [Friday] evening preceding the Great Sabbath is illustrated by a story (Levy iii. 360, *Gen. r.*, Wü. p. 47) about a Jewish tailor, who ventured to outbid the servant of "a ruler" in Rome by buying a fish, the only one in the shop, for twelve denarii. The ruler called the tailor before him to explain his conduct. "My lord," said the tailor, "it is a day on which all our sins, which we have committed during the whole year, are to be forgiven. When such a day comes *ought we not to honour it?*"

It is worth noting that in the Double Tradition of Matthew (vii. 9—11) and Luke (xi. 11—13) where Jesus wishes to describe the willingness of the Father in heaven to give (Mt.) "good [things]" or (Lk.) "the Holy Spirit," to those that ask Him, the one metaphor in which Matthew and Luke agree (according to the text of W. H.) is that in which the good gift is represented by "a fish" (as the opposite of "a serpent"). For the rest (Mt. "bread...stone," Lk. "egg...scorpion") they disagree.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 29. "Twelve basketfuls" (R.V.), in Mark¹

Of the differences between the parallel columns printed below, one has been discussed incidentally above, namely, the Synoptic use of the verb "satisfied" (literally "foddered") where John has "filled²." Mark's phrase "and of [Gk *from*] the fishes" may either be taken with "broken pieces" so as to mean "and [*broken pieces*] of the fishes," or with "some," understood, so as to mean "and [*some*] of the fishes³." The frequent use of the Hebrew "*from*" to mean "*some of*" decidedly favours the latter interpretation here; and so does the Johannine use of "from" in the saying of Jesus to the

¹ Mk vi. 42—3
(R.V.)

(42) And they did all eat, and were filled (ἐχορτάσθησαν).

(43) And they took up broken pieces, twelve basketfuls (κοφίνων πληρώματα), and also of the fishes.

Mt. xiv. 20
(R.V.)

(20) And they did all eat, and were filled (ἐχορτάσθησαν): and they took up that which remained over of the broken pieces, twelve baskets full (κοφίνους πλήρεις).

Lk. ix. 17
(R.V.)

(17) And they did eat, and were all filled (ἐχορτάσθησαν): and there was taken up that which remained over to them of broken pieces, twelve baskets (κόφωοι).

Jn vi. 12—13
(R.V.)

(12) And when they were filled (ἐνεπλήσθησαν), he saith unto his disciples, Gather up the broken pieces which remain over, that nothing be lost.

(13) So they gathered them up, and filled twelve baskets (κοφίνους) with broken pieces from the five barley loaves, which remained over unto them that had eaten.

Mk viii. 8 (R.V.)

And they did eat, and were filled (ἐχορτάσθησαν); and they took up, of broken pieces that remained over, seven baskets (σφυρίδας).

Mt. xv. 37 (R.V.)

And they did all eat, and were filled (ἐχορτάσθησαν): and they took up that which remained over of the broken pieces, seven baskets full (σφυρίδας πλήρεις).

² See above, p. 104 foll.

³ Gesen. 580 *b*, *inter alia*, quotes Exod. xvi. 27 "there went out [*some*] from the people" (where LXX inserts *τινές*), Lev. xxv. 49 "[*some one*] from the kinsfolk may redeem it," LXX ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων...λυτρώσεται, which would naturally be rendered "redeem from the kinsfolk."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

seven fishermen after Christ's resurrection "Bring [*some*] of (lit. *from*) the fish that ye have now caught¹."

A more important point is the ambiguity of the Marcan "they took up," referring to the broken pieces. Grammatically, "*they*" would mean the previously mentioned "*all*," that is to say, the multitude. Luke—in accordance with Mark's vague use of "they" in such phrases as "*they say*" to mean a passive ("*it is said*")—substitutes a passive "*there was taken up*." John defines the agents with remarkable distinctness, not only assigning the act to the disciples but adding that Jesus gave express commandment to them to perform it: "Gather ye the broken-pieces that have superabounded that nothing may be lost²."

Here, if "crumbs" falling from the food had been meant, the Greek word for "crumbs" used in Christ's Dialogue with the Syrophenician woman might have been employed³. Nor would any form of the word "superabundant" (in Greek, *perissos*) have been needed⁴. On the other hand, to suppose that the meaning is "portions deliberately broken off," and that Jesus broke them off, raises the question, "Is it likely that John would represent Jesus as breaking off 'superabundant' pieces, so as to cause waste?" The difficulty might lead us to con-

¹ Jn xxi. 10 Ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὧν ἐπιάσατε νῦν. Chrys. retains "from," κελεύει ἐκ τῶν ὀ. ἐνεγκεῖν, but Nonnus (ἄξατε...νεπόδων...ἄγρην) drops it. The context does not shew why "*the fishes*" might not have been mentioned instead of "*some of the fishes*," nor why the latter is expressed in an idiom unusual except in Hebraic Greek. After Christ's command, Peter "went on board and drew the net to land full of great fishes." It may be implied, but it is not stated, that he "brought [*some*] of *them*" to Jesus as specimens and proofs of success.

² Jn vi. 12 Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα.

³ Mk vii. 28, Mt. xv. 27 ψιχία, on which see Levy iv. 140 *a* and *Pes.* 10 *b* describing a "child" as "crumbling his bread."

⁴ Some form of περισσεύειν is used by Mt., Lk., and Jn in the Five Thousand, and by Mt. in the Four Thousand, but περισσεύματα by Mk in the Four Thousand.

clude—especially as John has not described Jesus as “breaking” the bread—that the multitude are to be regarded as wastefully breaking off from their portions large “pieces” too big to be called “crumbs,” and that John meant such “pieces” as these. This would accord with Origen’s view that it is the unworthiness of the multitude that prevents them from consuming all the nourishment provided for them¹.

But these arguments may be misleading unless supplemented by the probability (we may almost say the certainty) that John is influenced by the words of Elisha over the barley loaves, “Thus saith the Lord, They shall eat and *they shall cause to superabound or leave thereof*,” that is to say, “*They shall be satisfied and shall have a superfluity*”². This saying about the barley loaves of Elisha, if applied to the Johannine barley loaves of Jesus, might meet the objection “The Lord could not have broken more pieces than were needed.” The mystical answer might be, in John’s words, “He knew what he would do,” that is to say, “He knew that what was apparent waste would not be waste, because it would come back as in a future ‘gathering together,’ so that ‘nothing should be lost’³.” In this sense, the pieces that were broken were *not* “more than were needed,” if the lesson of the sign was to be fully taught. It was intended that some of the food should be “left,” or that there should be a “*superabundance*.”

These remarks may explain why Mark (alone of the Evangelists) omits, in his Feeding of the Five Thousand, all mention

¹ Origen *Comm. Matt.* xi. 19 (Lomm. iii. 125). The four thousand are superior to the five thousand, and “more receptive (*χωρητικώτεροι*)” (comp. Jn viii. 37 *ὃ χωρεῖ*) so that they leave less unconsumed.

² 2 K. iv. 43—44. The verb יתר, “leave,” may mean “leave as a remnant saved from destruction,” but it may also mean “leave as superfluous”; and forms of יתר = *περισσεία* about 13 times, and *περισσός* more than 20 times.

³ Jn vi. 12. What the Jews rejected might be regarded as coming back to the Apostles in the form of a “gathering” of the Gentiles (see Rom. xi. 15—32).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

of "*superabundance*," and substitutes, literally, "*fillings*," in a curious phrase rendered by R.V. "*basketfuls*," but by A.V. "*baskets full*¹"; Matthew has the latter, "*baskets full*," but retains "*superabundant*²"; Luke makes no mention of "*full*" in any form, but has "*superabundant*³." The explanation suggested is, that the Hebrew "*left*," or "*superabounding*," twice repeated in the miracle of Elisha, was taken by Mark in the Feeding of the Five Thousand as meaning "*running over*" or "*quite full*⁴." By taking it thus, the charge of imputing to Jesus a superfluous multiplication of food would be somewhat softened⁵.

Luke inserts the dative "*to them*" after "*superabounded*." John inserts a similar dative, but one of a much more special kind—"to those who had consumed [*the food*]." This Greek word "*consume* [*food*]"—meaning in literary Greek "*gnaw*," "*eat up*," and often applied to eating raw flesh, etc.—occurs in LXX fairly often to represent the ordinary Hebrew

¹ Mk vi. 43 κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων, A.V. "twelve baskets full of the fragments, and of the fishes." "*The fragments*" suggests "*the fragments that would naturally fall from such a meal*." But there is no "*the*." The literal rendering is "broken pieces, fillings of twelve baskets, and of (*lit.* from) the fishes."

² Mt. xiv. 20 τὸ περισσεῖον τῶν κλασμάτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις, "that which was [*found*] superabounding of the broken pieces, twelve baskets [*quite*] full," where "*full*" is emphasized by its position.

³ Lk. ix. 17 τὸ περισσεύσαν αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων κόφινοι δώδεκα, "that which was [*found*] superabounding by them (*or*, for them) of broken pieces, baskets [*precisely*] twelve," where "*twelve*" is emphasized by its position.

⁴ Πλήρωμα occurs rather rarely (15 times) in LXX. It corresponds to Heb. "*full*." Cant. v. 12 "*channels of waters*" is paraphrased as "*fillings* (πληρώματα) of waters" to express full-flowing streams. Much more defensibly might the Heb. "*left*," יתר, be thus paraphrased.

⁵ Note however that Mark does not avoid περισσεύματα in Mk viii. 8 (the Four Thousand).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"eat," but mostly in a bad sense. In the Prophets it refers to the devouring effect of fire, rust, or blight, or the eating of food defiled or offered to idols. In Genesis it does not occur once. But in Exodus and Leviticus it is frequent, occurring about ten times in prohibitions ("this shall not be eaten") (as well as positively). For our purposes, however, the two points of special importance are that (1) it occurs for the first time in connection with the Paschal Lamb, of which it is said "It shall be *consumed* in one house," and that (2) this follows the precept "Ye shall cause none of it to *superabound* (lit. *be left over and above*) till the morning¹."

Do not these facts go some way toward justifying what at first sight seems the wild imagination of Origen—namely, that a fault of non-receptiveness is implied in those who "leave broken pieces"? May it not be that John had in view both *dicta*:—(1) that of the Law "*Ye shall cause none of it to superabound*," and (2) that of Elisha "*They shall cause to superabound*"? At all events John would probably regard the "superabounding" as divinely ordained in order that remnants from the Bread of the Gospel, rejected by the unbelievers among the Jews, might pass to the Gentiles; and yet, as in the Epistle to the Romans, the rejection would be regarded as a fault in the Jews, who did not discern, and receive in its entirety, the Living Bread, which was also the Paschal Lamb.

Jerome calls Christ's distribution of bread "a sowing of food," and implies, somewhat obscurely, that the food was "divided into (*or* with a view to) a manifold harvest²." About the distribution, the following comment has been preserved as coming from Ammonius: "He [*i.e.* Jesus] did not give

¹ Exod. xii. 10 "ye shall let none of it remain," Exod. xii. 46 "it shall be eaten (*βρωθήσεται*). The word for "superabound" is יתר, the same as that in 2 K. iv. 43—44.

² Jerome, on Mt. xiv. 19, "*Frangente Domino, seminarium fit ciborum. Si enim fuissent integri...nec divisi in multiplicem segetem....*"

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

[the food] to the multitudes to carry (?), but to the disciples, since He above all things desired to train these—the destined teachers of the world. For the multitude was not destined to receive any great fruit from the miracle (*lit.* wonder). For they straightway forgot it and began to ask for another miracle (*lit.* wonder). But these [*i.e.* the disciples] were destined to receive no common gain¹." This appears to express at all events an important part of John's meaning. The first harvest was, so to speak, a failure—the harvest for the multitude, the Five Thousand, that is, for Israel after the flesh. The second harvest—the gathering of the fragments by the Apostles, regarded as their harvest by Ammonius—was not a failure. It was the harvest of souls to be subsequently gathered by the Twelve, who (in spite of Judas) were typical of the Twelve Tribes of Israel after the Spirit. The key to the Johannine meaning lies in the words of Jesus "that nothing may be lost"—a phrase peculiar (with slight variations) to the Fourth

¹ Cramer p. 243 on Jn vi. 13. The words οὐκ ἔδωκε δὲ τοῖς ὄχλοις βαστάζειν ἀλλὰ τοῖς μαθηταῖς somewhat resemble a passage from Origen's commentary on Mt. xiv. 16 (quoted below, see § 33) where Origen applies φέρειν to the disciples. And Origen there, like Ammonius here, uses παιδεύω to describe Jesus as "training" the disciples through the miracle of the Five Thousand. But Origen represents Jesus as saying, in effect, to the disciples, "I have trained you to give the Bread. Now give it." Ammonius—much more accordantly with Johannine doctrine—regards the "training" as now going on in the course of this miracle ("since he especially desired to train these (ἐπειδὴ μάλιστα τούτους παιδεῖσαι ἐβούλετο)"). And Ammonius speaks of the disciples, not as "teaching" but as "destined to be teachers (τοὺς μέλλοντας ἔσσεσθαι διδασκάλους)." Ammonius meets the objection that Judas received a basketful by saying that, as the rest of the Twelve received "no ordinary gain," so Judas received "no ordinary condemnation when he carried the basket (ἦν δὲ καὶ τῷ Ἰούδα κατάκριμα τὸ γινόμενον οὐ τὸ τυχόν, βαστάζοντι τὸν κόφινον)." Does Ammonius mean, in his first sentence, "He did not give to the multitudes [the right] to carry (βαστάζειν) [the baskets of fragments] but to the disciples," and does he, in the last, allude to Jn xii. 6 "[Judas] (R.V. marg.) carried (ἐβάσταξεν) . . . "?

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Gospel, and used to describe something corresponding to what the Prophets call the "remnant" of Israel¹.

As regards Mark's ambiguous words "and from the fishes" John intervenes, at least negatively, so far as to indicate that there were no fishes or fragments of fishes in the twelve baskets. The baskets were "filled [to the top] from the five barley-loaves²." According to his view, the fishes that Mark described as being "taken up" were not placed in the twelve baskets. They must have been brought to Jesus, if at all, separately.

As to the difference between the "twelve *cophinoi*" filled in the earlier miracle, and the "seven *sphurides*" filled in the later one, we have seen above³ that a distinction between kinds of "baskets" is recognised by Jewish Tradition in connection with the "basket" of firstfruits which is made the subject of a kind of votive hymn in Deuteronomy⁴. Philo paraphrases this hymn in a fragment of a treatise on the Feast of Baskets in which he says that it was celebrated "*on two seasons*" of the year⁵. But Rashi says expressly "*once in the year, not twice*⁶." In this, he is following the Talmud, which says "Firstfruits

¹ Comp. Jn iii. 16 ἵνα...μὴ ἀπόληται, vi. 12 ἵνα μὴ τι ἀπόληται, vi. 39 ἵνα...μὴ ἀπολέσω, x. 28 οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται, xvii. 12 οὐδεὶς...ἀπώλετο εἰ μὴ..., xviii. 9 οὐκ ἀπώλεσα.

² John expresses Mark's πληρώματα, Mt. πλήρεις, Lk. om., by (vi. 13) ἐγέμισαν, using the same word that he used before (ii. 7 *bis*) in the miracle of Cana, to describe the waterpots as "filled to the top."

³ See § 2.

⁴ Deut. xxvi. 2—4 "Thou shalt put it in a basket...the priest shall take the basket," LXX κάρταλλον, Aq. ἀγγεῖον. The Heb. occurs (Gesen. 380 *b*) only there and *ib.* xxviii. 5, 17 LXX ἀποθήκη.

⁵ See Philo *post* ii. 298 ἔστι δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ἑορτὴ μὲν θεοῦ, ἑορτῆς δὲ πανήγυρις ἣν καλοῦσι Κάρταλλον... § 3 τὸ ἄσμα τοῦτο (*i.e.* Deut. xxvi. 5—15) ᾄδεται δυοὶ καιροῖς.

⁶ On Deut. xxvi. 3 Rashi says "una vice in anno, non vero bis," and (on *ib.* 10) "non...nisi a fine septem septimanarum," *i.e.* from the end of the week of weeks which introduced the Feast of Pentecost.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

are *not to be offered before Pentecost*¹." The Targum on Deuteronomy paraphrases "basket" by three words, and the LXX renders "basket" in a later passage of Deuteronomy by "receptacles"². Also a Jewish distinction is made between these "*baskets*" when made of metal and when made of twigs or similar material³.

Pseudo-Jerome says "The seven *sportae* (i.e. *sphurides*) are the first seven Churches. The broken pieces of bread are the mystical perceptions belonging to the *first Pentecost*⁴." This mention of "Pentecost" connects the Christian narrative with the "baskets" in Deuteronomy, according to the Rabbinical view adopted by Rashi ("not before Pentecost"), and with the Symposium of the Therapeutae described by Philo as honouring not only the seventh day but also the square of seven, i.e. the Pentecost⁵. On the other hand, Philo's mention of "*two seasons*" indicates another view in accordance with which there might be "*two*" Symposia, one of a rudimentary character. Such a rudimentariness would be symbolized by "barley," which, as we have seen, John alone mentions in connection with the Feeding of the Five Thousand.

¹ *Biccurim* (Mishna) i. 3 quoted by Wagenseil (*Sota* p. 661).

² On Deut. xxvi. 3 the three words of Targ. Jer. I are rendered by Walton (1) "canistra," (2) "sportulas," (3) "cophinos papyraceos." In Deut. xxviii. 5, 17, LXX has ἀποθήκαι.

³ So *Tosephoth* quoted by Wagenseil (*Sota* p. 662). *J. Biccurim* (Mishna) iii. 8 says "The rich offered their firstfruits in *καθατοι* plated with gold and silver." Levy ii. 168 *a* gives כִּי (the Deuteronomic "basket") as "ein grosses, metallenes Gefäss" and quotes *j. Sota* ix. 24 *b* "a leaden *receptacle* full of barley bran."

⁴ On Mk viii. 1 foll. "Septem panes dona sunt septem Spiritus Sancti. Quatuor millia annus est Novi Testamenti cum quatuor temporibus. Septem sportae primae septem Ecclesiae. Fragmenta panum mystici intellectus primae septimanae sunt," i.e. they are the outpourings of "mystical understanding (or, perception)," with the gift of tongues, recorded in Acts ii. 1 foll.

⁵ Philo ii. 481 οὐ μόνον τὴν ἀπλὴν ἑβδομάδα ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν [*i.e.* the power or square of the hebdomad] τεθηπότες. . . ἔστι δὲ προεόρτιος μεγίστης ἑορτῆς, ἣν πεντηκοντὰς ἔλαχεν.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

At this stage, the following objection may be raised: "John is supposed to regard the Feeding of the Five Thousand as rudimentary. Mark is supposed to relate the Feeding of the Four Thousand as a miracle of an advanced character. Luke omits the latter. According to the rule of Johannine Intervention, John ought to insert it. But he does not. Is not the rule broken?"

We reply that the rule is not broken because John does insert a second miracle of feeding, and that, too, "of an advanced character." Only John, as often, does not repeat what is in Mark but adds something corresponding to what is in Mark. This John places after the Resurrection. Whereas Mark symbolizes the advance by a change from the Jewish *cophinos*¹ to the Gentile *sphuris* or *sporta*, John symbolizes it in a different way by representing Jesus as feeding seven disciples from one loaf (*artos*) and one fish after they have caught and presented to Him an offering of "a hundred and fifty-three" fishes. Through that mystic number, representing the Law merged in the Spirit², and through the context as a whole, John leads us to see, in that final meal after the Resurrection, a type of divine Unity working through human multitudinousness, so as to lift mankind above Jewish and Gentile distinctions, bringing about for all alike the fulfilment of Christ's promise about the one "bread" or "loaf": "The *bread* (*artos*) that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world³."

§ 30. "*They that ate the loaves,*" in Mark⁴

Instead of the past participle Matthew has the present participle of a different verb (*esthivn*) never used by John,

¹ The connection of *cophinus* with *Judaeus* twice by Juvenal iii. 14, vi. 542, justifies our regarding it as being thus connected in the minds of Gentile readers of the Gospels in the first century.

² See *Joh. Gr.* 2283 c.

³ Jn vi. 51.

⁴ Mk vi. 44 οἱ φάγοντες τοὺς ἄρτους, Mt. xiv. 21 οἱ δὲ ἐσθίουτες.

but used by the Synoptists in discussions about eating and in the narratives of the Eucharist where a past tense is not required¹. We have seen above that John here uses about the eaters a word ("consume") that seemed to allude to the eating of the Paschal Lamb². This hypothesis of allusion will be confirmed if we can shew that John had some reason, or at all events some consistent method, in his avoidance of *esthiein*.

This is shewn by a passage where John represents Jesus as quoting from the Psalms "He that *eateth* my bread lifted up his heel against me³." Here the LXX uses *esthiein*. But John uses a word signifying "*chew* (*trōgein*)," which occurs nowhere in the LXX and only once in N.T. outside the Fourth Gospel⁴. In that single instance—which occurs in Matthew's description of the luxurious feeding (lit. "*chewing* and drinking") in the days of Noah—the parallel Luke has the ordinary *esthiscin*⁵. This is easily intelligible, but why should John—

The latter might be rendered "the eaters," the former "those that had eaten the loaves." For the parallels, see below, p. 146, n. 3.

¹ See *Joh. Voc.* 1680 b. *Φαγείν* is freq. in the Synoptists and fairly freq. in Jn, but Jn never uses *ἐσθίειν*. The difference between *ἐσθίειν* and *φαγείν* is often simply a difference of tense, i.e. of time, *ἐσθίειν* having no aorist, and *φαγείν* no present or imperfect.

² See pp. 137–8.

³ Jn xiii. 18 ὁ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον. Nonnus has *ἐρεπτων*, a word applied to horses, geese, fishes, feeding in multitudes, but applicable to men with a notion of greediness.

⁴ *Τρώγω* is mostly used with an object. But it is frequently used without an object where the juxtaposition of "drinking" makes the meaning clear. Steph. *Thes.* quotes *πίνειν καὶ τρώγειν* from Demosth. p. 402, 21, and Plutarch *Mor.* 716 E, and *τρώγειν καὶ πίνειν* from *ib.* 613 B.

⁵ Mt. xxiv. 38 τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες (Lk. xvii. 27 ἡσθιον, ἔπινον) describing the revels of those on whom the deluge came. *Τρώγω*, "chew," is applied in various contexts to feeding on uncooked food. In Mt., it means "chewing" delicacies that might be called "dessert," where "eat for pleasure" would express the meaning, as in *Hermas Sim.* v. 3 "Take only bread and water, and give in alms from your *delicacies* that you were intending (lit.) to *chew* (*τρώγειν*)"

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

without any justification derivable from the Hebrew text of Scripture—represent Jesus as quoting from the Psalms the words “He that *cheweth* my bread”?

The following explanation is obscurely suggested by Jerome's commentary on the Psalm, and (more clearly) by Origen's commentary on earlier passages in the Gospel where John represents Jesus as using the word “*chew*¹.” Jerome says that Judas “was receiving celestial food...and distributing it to others².” Origen, when commenting on what he calls the “paraphrase” of the Psalm as quoted by Jesus, says that the bread referred to was “most nourishing³.” Elsewhere, in his treatise on the daily bread in the Lord's Prayer, he takes in order the passages in which Jesus speaks of the need of His disciples to “*chew*” His flesh and “*drink*” His blood, and not only repeats the epithet “nourishing” again, but adds to it others such as “solid,” and “athletic⁴.” Taken together, Origen's references indicate that the Greek word had, for him, in one aspect, its usual sense, but in another aspect, a sense so new as to be startling—“gnawing” raw flesh⁵.

i.e. to eat for pleasure. In other contexts it might mean “*chew* (*a crust*)” and be applied to a beggar. See Steph. *Thes.* τρώγω, which shews that the grammarians expressly distinguish τρώγω, as having a more particular meaning than ἐσθίω, and as being applied to the eating of τραγήματα, “sweetmeats.”

¹ Jn vi. 54, 56, 57, 58. In all these, Jesus is speaking. John never uses τρώγω in his own person.

² Jerome on Ps. xli. 9.

³ Origen on Jn xiii. 18 (Lomm. ii. 419) παραπέφρασται, (*ib.* 420) τροφιμωσάτων.

⁴ Origen *De Orat.* § 27 (Lomm. xvii. 205 foll.) leads us from δ τροφίμος λόγος to the thought of its στεργύτης and εἰτονία, as being ἀθλητικὴ τροφή distinguishing it from “manna” and “milk.”

⁵ The food is not subjected to the action of fire, so that the Greek τρώγω may be used in speaking about it. It is also “flesh” with the “blood” in it, so that “chewing” and “drinking” go together.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

A close examination of the Greek justifies Origen. Neither the Latin, nor the Syriac, nor the English Versions represent the abruptness with which the word "*chewing*" is as it were thrown in the faces of the Jews by the Fourth Gospel after they have said "How can this [man] give us his flesh to *eat* (*phagein*)?" It is true that Jesus is made to reply at first with a repetition of their word ("Except ye *eat* (*phagein*) the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves"). But He immediately adds "He that *cheweth* (*trōgein*) my flesh and drinketh my blood hath life eternal.... He that *cheweth* (*trōgein*) my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father sent me and I live because of the Father, [so] also he that *cheweth* (*trōgein*) me—he too shall live because of me. This is the bread that came down from Heaven. Not as the fathers *ate* (*phagein*) [manna] and died¹—[not so is it now]; he that *cheweth* (*trōgein*) this bread shall live for ever²."

These last words, contrasting the death that came after Israel "*ate*" the manna with the life that will belong to him that "*cheweth*" the "bread" that "came down from heaven," should be illustrated from Israel's complaint about the manna that it had no sustaining moisture for them. "Our soul is *dried away*," they cried, and "who shall give us *flesh* to eat³?" The Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as affording to the spiritual Israel a food of spiritual nature that should satisfy both hunger and thirst. It was to be the "*flesh*" of the living Son, which

¹ "Died." See Numb. xiv. 30 "save Caleb...and Joshua."

² Jn vi. 52—8. Our English Versions have "*eat*" throughout, and so have the Syriac. The Latin Versions vary somewhat strangely; *d* renders φαγεῖν by "manducare" in 52 and 58 (where *d* has "non sicut manducaverunt (ἐφαγον)...qui manducat (ὁ τρώγων).") Chrysostom, commenting on this passage, makes no comment on the transition in Jn from φαγεῖν to τρώγειν.

³ Numb. xi. 4—6 בשר. Comp. Ps. lxxviii. 20 "Will he provide *flesh* (שׂר), LXX τράπεζαν, where Rashi says that שׂר (which rather suggests flesh with blood in it, Gesen. 984—5) stands for בשר.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

could not possibly be received apart from the reception of His blood. Isaiah invites the soul to "eat" the food of heaven as being "wine" and "milk," not mentioning, but assuming, that it included "bread¹." So John connects the life and being of the Son with "bread" and with "flesh," and even with "blood," not mentioning, but assuming, that this included "wine²."

§ 31. "*Five thousand men*" or "*about five thousand [men]*"³

The following questions arise out of the Marcan phrases. Why does Mark insert "men (*viri*, not *homines*⁴)" in one narrative and omit it in the other? Why does Mark insert "*about*" in one narrative and omit it in the other? Why does John insert "*in number*" before "*about five thousand*"? Why does Matthew in both narratives insert "apart from women and

¹ Is. lv. 1 "buy and eat," where Ibn Ezra remarks of "wine" and "milk" that each serves for food as well as for drink.

² John's above-noted application of τρώγειν to Judas in an altered quotation from LXX is perhaps part of a consistent tradition (not mentioned by the Synoptists) concerning the bread dipped in wine and given to Judas alone.

³ Mk vi. 44 (R.V.) And they that ate the loaves were five thousand men.	Mt. xiv. 21 (R.V.) And they that did eat were about five thousand men, beside women and children.	Lk. ix. 14 (R.V.) For they were about five thousand men.	Jn vi. 10 (R.V.) So the men sat down, in number about five thou- sand.
---	--	---	--

Mk viii. 9 (R.V.)
 And they were about four
 thousand.

Mt. xv. 38 (R.V.)
 And they that did eat were
 four thousand men, beside wo-
 men and children.

Note that *ἄνδρες* is inserted except in Mk viii. 9. The Greek phrases are as follows. In the Five Thousand, Mk vi. 44 πεντακισ-
 χίλιοι *ἄνδρες*, Mt. xiv. 21 *ἄνδρες ὥσει π.*, χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων,
 Lk. ix. 14 ὥσει *ἄνδρες π.*, Jn vi. 10 οἱ *ἄνδρες* (or, *ἄνδρες*) τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς
 π. In the Four Thousand, Mk viii. 9 ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι, Mt. xv. 38
 τετρακισχίλιοι (marg. ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι) *ἄνδρες*, χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων
 (marg. παιδίων καὶ γυναικῶν).

⁴ "Men," *ἄνδρες*. Ἀνὴρ occurs in Mk elsewhere, only in the
 sing. vi. 20 "a righteous man," x. 2, 12 "husband."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

children"? And why do Luke and John omit Matthew's clause?

If we look for illustrations from Scripture to answer these questions, we find that the first Hebrew instance of "*about*" *with numbers of men* occurs in the description of Israel going forth from Egypt¹. The same passage contains almost the first instance of the plural of "man of military age²," as distinguished from women and children: "And the children of Israel departed...*about* six hundred thousand *on-foot* (or, *footmen*)—*the men* [of military age], apart from children³." This looks back to the first Biblical use of the plural of the word, uttered by Pharaoh, who refuses to let the "*children*" go, but will let the "*men*" (Heb. *geber*) go. In the LXX, these two passages are the first where we find Mark's Greek word for "*men*" representing the Hebrew *geber*⁴. Later on, the Pentateuch omits both "*about*" and "*men of military age*" in the passionate exclamation of Moses "*Six hundred thousand footmen* (or, *travellers on foot*) are the people amid whom I am⁵." Jewish tradition notes the apparent discrepancy between this and the preceding mention of the same number; for, during

¹ Exod. xii. 37 Heb. כ *"like," i.e. about.* LXX εἰς "*amounting to.*" This is the first instance mentioned in Gesen. 453 a. Strong's Concordance, which is generally very accurate, omits it.

² Heb. גִּבּוֹר, *geber*. See Gesen. 149—50.

³ Exod. xii. 37 "*apart from children* (הַטַּי)," LXX πλην τῆς ἀποσκευῆς. Ἀποσκευή, outside LXX, would mean "*baggage,*" the Latin "*impedimenta,*" but in LXX it freq. represents הַטַּי, "*children.*" Here Aq. has χωρὶς ἀπὸ νηπίου, Sym. ... τοῦ ὄχλου. Comp. Exod. x. 10—11, where Pharaoh says to Moses that he will not let go the "*children* (הַטַּי)" (LXX, Aq. and Sym. as here) but "*Go ye, now, the men* [of military age]," Aq. πορεύεσθε δὲ, οἱ ἄνδρες, LXX πορευέσθωσαν δὲ οἱ ἄνδρες (a variation that somewhat resembles the variation in the punctuation of Jn vi. 10). Steph. *Thes.* does not mention this meaning of ἀποσκευῆς, but see Gen. xxxiv. 29, xliii. 8, etc.

⁴ Ἄνθρω in Pentateuch occurs about 180 times, but not as representing *geber* except in these two passages and Deut. xxii. 5 (forbidding an adult male to put on woman's clothing, and *vice versa*).

⁵ Numb. xi. 21.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the interval, the number is stated elsewhere to have increased. Accordingly Rashi says "Moses was not solicitous" about including additions¹. Many passages in Midrash comment on the numbering of Israel on or before the night of the Exodus as one of ten occasions on which Israel was numbered².

Passing to the Gospels we see that some of their variations correspond to variations in Hebrew Scripture or Jewish tradition. Mark's omission in one narrative, and insertion in another, of "*about*" and "*men [of military age]*," corresponds to the omission of these words in Numbers and the insertion of them in Exodus. Matthew's insertion of "*men*" in both narratives indicates that he regarded "*men*" as emphatic, meaning "*men, not to speak of women and children.*" This followed the precedent of Exodus, where "*apart from children*" was interpreted by R. Ishmael as "*apart from the women and the little ones,*" and by R. Jonathan as "*apart from the women, the children, and the aged*"³.

¹ See Exod. xxxviii. 26, Numb. i. 45—6 "all that were able to go forth to war...603,550" (comp. Numb. ii. 32). Rashi, on Numb. xi. 21, says "Non sollicitus fuit [Moses] ut singulatim numeraret," and tells us of a Rabbi who suggested that the additional 3550 (called by him 3000) were not included because they did not murmur—so that they did not belong to the sixty myriads destined to die in the wilderness.

This view is confirmed by Sir. xvi. 8 "So were 600,000 רגלי, edd. *footmen, that were taken away in the arrogance of their heart,*" Sir. xlvi. 8 "two alone were reserved, out of 600,000 רגלי, edd. *men on foot.*" Clem. Rom. § 43 calls them "*the 600,000,*" although at the time mentioned (Numb. xvii. 1 foll.) the number would have been increased, συνεκάλεσεν πάντα τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, τὰς ἑξακοσίας χιλιάδας τῶν ἀνδρῶν.

Sota 12 b gives a quaint interpretation of רגלי, "*footmen,*" in the utterance of Moses. It meant "*on my account,*" and implied a presumption for which Moses was punished!

² Ten occasions are mentioned in Numb. i. on Numb. ii. 32, and Pesikta sect. 2, Wü. p. 18 etc. In Numb. i. on Numb. xxvi. 2 it is said that whenever Israel went wrong it needed to be numbered.

³ See Mechilt. on Exod. xii. 37.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

It is more difficult to say why John inserts "*in number*," before "about five thousand." It is apparently superfluous. Yet in his subtle, mystical, and allusive Gospel cautious critics will very seldom confidently commit themselves to a statement that they have found superfluities. Can it be that John is affected by Jewish traditions above referred to concerning the "numbering" of Israel as being connected with imperfection or evil?

That, perhaps, is the Johannine view. When Luke in the Acts mentions "number" in passage after passage describing the growth of the Church, he does it with obvious satisfaction¹. But it is doubtful whether John has any such satisfaction in the numbering of the Five Thousand. Regarded mystically, the number "five" is of the flesh, like the "five husbands" of the woman of Samaria; and "the five barley loaves" are typical of rudimentary revelation. Regarded historically (according to John's view), the Five Thousand so completely fail to understand the nature of Christ's sign that they are described as purposing "to snatch him away that they may make him a king²." We can at least say that this explanation is more probable than the hypothesis that John inserted "*in number*"—and this in a narrative so familiar to the Church in various forms and so obviously typical—without attaching to the insertion some meaning, or at all events some allusive significance.

¹ Ἀριθμός occurs in the Acts (iv. 4, etc.), four times out of five, about the growth of the Church. But in the Epistles it occurs only in Rom. ix. 27 "If the *number* of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea *it shall be the remnant that shall be saved.*" This appears to depreciate the value of "numbering." The other N.T. instances of ἀριθμός (except Lk. xxii. 3 "Judas...of the number of the twelve") are all (10) in Revelation. This book also (vii. 9) speaks of "a great multitude which no one could number, standing before the throne." The first mention of "counting" and "numbering" in the Bible is in Gen. xiii. 16 (comp. xvi. 10) and declares that the seed of Abraham *cannot* be numbered.

² Jn vi. 15.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 32. *Irenaeus and Origen on the "five thousand" in the Acts, and Clement of Alexandria on the "five loaves"*

The narratives of the Feeding of the Five Thousand are likely to have been influenced not only by allusions to the events in the history of Israel, and particularly the giving of the manna, but also by prospective allusions to the growth of the Christian Church, more particularly during the period when thousands at a time were converted, according to the Acts, by the preaching of Peter. This influence is not likely to have been so great as that of Eucharistic allusion, but still it is not to be passed by.

Irenaeus says that the convincing effect of prophecy in bringing souls into the Church explains the success of the apostolic preaching, whereby "on one day there were baptized *three thousand men, and four, and five*¹." The Acts mentions the "baptizing" of "three thousand," and subsequently speaks of "five thousand," but nowhere "*four thousand*"; and such language, however it may be explained, shews that early variations might arise about the details of the growth of the Church, some of which might bear on the Gospel narratives of miraculous Feeding². Origen, if his text is not corrupt,

¹ Iren. iv. 23. 2 "et una die baptizati sunt hominum tria millia, et quatuor, et quinque."

² Acts ii. 41 οἱ μὲν οὖν...ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καὶ προσετέθησαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ψυχαὶ ὥσπερ τρισχίλιαι, iv. 4 πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἀκουσάντων τὸν λόγον ἐπίστευσαν καὶ ἐγενήθη ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὡς χιλιάδες πέντε. Grabe on Irenaeus points to Acts ii. 47 ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει τοῖς σωζομένους καθ' ἡμέραν as a possible explanation. The tradition from which Irenaeus borrowed may have stated that the number of the baptized "*became* on one day 3000, and then 4000, and then 5000." "The [total] number *became*" might easily be confused with "the number [added on this or that occasion] *was*." Comp. Acts iv. 4 ἐγενήθη, A.V. "*was*," R.V. "*came to be*." This may be illustrated by a difference between Lk. ix. 13—14 Curet. "'But let us go ourselves [and] buy food for all this multitude,' *for they were become five thousand men*," and SS "'Except we go and buy ourselves food for all this multitude, *for*

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

appears to combine the Feeding of the Five Thousand by our Lord with the conversion of the Three Thousand in the Acts, and to regard both as fulfilments of the exclamation of Isaiah, "Shall a nation be brought forth at once¹?" Jerome, commenting fully on the same prophecy, says "It also refers to that time when, on one day, there believed three thousand, and five thousand, of the Jewish people²." But Origen's text, as it stands, by inserting a mention of the *Saviour's* "*Incarnation*," and also by placing the Five Thousand before the Three Thousand, makes it difficult to suppose that he is referring merely to the Acts. Possibly "three," in Origen's text, is an error for "four." His view certainly was that the miracle of the Four Thousand typified the inclusion of the Gentiles. This "including," if Origen wrote "four thousand," he may have described (in the language of the Acts) as "adding," just as he describes the miracle of the Five Thousand (in the language of the Acts) as "believing":—"When the Saviour

they are five thousand men." Possibly Acts iv. 4 ἐγενήθη ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν is a corruption of some tradition that "there was made a numbering (ἀριθμῶσις) of the men." Something is needed (but Hebrew origination might suffice) to explain the omission of ὁ before ἀριθμὸς (comp. Acts vi. 7 ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν μαθητῶν).

¹ Origen *Jerem. Hom.* ix. 3 (on Is. lxvi. 8) "But 'a nation was brought forth (ἐτέχθη) at once' when the Saviour (?) had been with us on earth (ὅτε ἐπιεδέδημκεν ὁ Σωτήρ) and in one day five thousand believed (ἐπίστευσαν) and on another day there were added (προσετέθησαν) three thousand." I do not understand the force of the perfect ἐπιεδέδημκεν contrasted with the aorists. Is it possible that we should read the pluperf. ἐπεδεδημήκει, i.e. "when the Saviour had [recently] been incarnate"? Comp. the earliest instance of ἐπιδημέω quoted in Euseb. *H.E.* iv. 3. 2 (from Quadratus) οὐδὲ ἐπιδημούντος μόνον τοῦ Σωτήρος ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαλλαγέντος. In that case we must suppose that Origen is quoting from the Acts but reverses the order of the Acts in order to put the larger number first: "There 'believed,' as the Acts says, five thousand men, and on another [and earlier] day there were added [to the Church], as the Acts says, three thousand."

² "Et ad illud tempus referre quando una die tria millia et quinque millia de Judaico populo crediderunt."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

was on earth and there 'believed' (Acts iv. 4) in one day Five Thousand, and in another day there were 'added' (Acts ii. 41) Four Thousand¹."

Other early Christian literature throws little light on distinctions between the Synoptic "five thousand" and "four thousand," or the "five loaves" and the "seven loaves." The plural "loaves" is not used by the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists². The only mention of the "five loaves" by Irenaeus is in an attempt to shew that the number "five" is of frequent occurrence in Scripture and need not have the mystical meaning attributed to it by heretics. In doing this, he asserts that "*five*" is the number of the pillars that support the veil of the Holy of Holies. But in fact there were "*four*"³. His error is the less excusable because Philo had taught that the "*four*" pillars before the Holy of Holies were spiritually superior to the "*five*" pillars before the screen of the Tabernacle⁴. Clement of Alexandria adopts Philo's interpretation of the "*five* pillars" as referring to the things of the senses and applies it depreciatively to "the *five* loaves," which, he says, "are most mystically broken by the Saviour, and supply fulness (?) to the crowd of those hearing Him; for great [indeed is] the [crowd] that gives heed to the things of sense as being alone realities⁵." Clement then mentions "the four pillars" that

¹ That is to say, the *order* of the two miracles is that of the Gospels, but the *language* is that of the Acts, because Origen regards the miracle placed second in the Gospels as being of the nature of an "addition" such as the Acts connects with "three thousand." If Origen wrote thus, it would be very natural for scribes to alter his "four" into "three" (Δ into Γ).

² Goodspeed gives it, however, as a v. r. of Cod. A in Justin Martyr *Apol.* lxvii. 3 ὡς προέφημεν... ἄρτος προσφέρεται, where προέφημεν refers to ch. lxv. and ch. lxvi. mentioning the sing. ἄρτος.

³ Iren. ii. 24. 4.

⁴ Philo on Exod. xxvi. 32—37. Irenaeus (see Grabe's note which should have been added in Clark's translation) has confused the two verses.

⁵ Clem. Alex. 665 ταύτη τοις μυστικώτατα πέντε ἄρτοι πρὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος

stand at the entrance of the Holy of Holies, as being typical of a more inward and spiritual knowledge. Then he passes to the number "seven," as being that of the planets and of the branches of the sacred lamp, and of "the seven eyes of the Lord" which ("they say") are "the seven spirits resting on the rod that flowers from the root of Jesse¹." Although Clement does not, in this connection, make mention of the "seven loaves" that were broken for the "four thousand," the transition suggests that he had that thought in his mind. If he had, it would be consistent with Origen's view that the miracle of the Four Thousand was higher in the spiritual scale than the earlier miracle of the Five Thousand.

§ 33. "*Give ye them to eat,*" *why omitted by John*

This omission has not been commented on above because our first business has been to discuss Marcan passages omitted or altered by Luke, and this is not one of them. All the Synoptists have the words "Give ye them to eat," and all of them, especially Luke, emphasize the pronoun "*ye*²." Origen explains the emphasis, allegorizing the "eating," as if Jesus meant "*Ye*, my disciples, *ye* whom I have trained to give the Bread of Life to others, give *ye* them to eat, and do not think of sending away the hungry multitude unfed³." Origen also, in his own person, declares that Jesus "said *Give ye them to*

κατακλῶνται καὶ πληθύνουσι τῷ ὄχλῳ τῶν ἀκρωμένων, πολλὸς γὰρ ὁ τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ὡς μόνοις οὖσι προσανέχων. Πληθύνω is perhaps used as a mild paraphrase of χορτάζω.

¹ Rev. v. 6, Is. xi. 1.

² In Mk vi. 37, Mt. xiv. 16 δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν, the addition of ὑμεῖς to δότε shews that the pronoun in "give *ye*" is emphasized; but in Lk. ix. 13 (W.H. txt) δότε αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν ὑμεῖς, "*ye*" is extraordinarily emphatic, coming at the end of the sentence.

³ Origen on Mt. xiv. 16 (Lomm. iii. 68) Ἐπεὶ οὖν παιδεύσας ὑμᾶς ἱκανοὺς ἐποίησα πρὸς τὸ διδόναι τοῖς δεομένοις λογικὴν τροφήν, ὑμεῖς δότε....

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

eat because of that power to feed others besides themselves which He had bestowed on the disciples¹."

It may be taken as certain that John did not believe that the disciples had received at this time the "power to feed others" in the full spiritual sense. Origen adds "So long as these five loaves and two fishes were not *borne* (or, *brought*) by the disciples of Jesus, they did not increase²." But John represents Jesus as Himself distributing the bread to the multitude³, and excludes the disciples from any part in the miracle except the collecting of the broken pieces. The Johannine view of the miracle is quite different from that of the Synoptists. In John, Jesus cannot say to the disciples "Give *ye* them to eat," for they have nothing to give. The loaves do not belong to them. Origen himself points out this, though he quaintly connects it with the inferior nature of the "barley" loaves: "John alone says that the loaves were 'barley loaves.' Wherefore, perhaps, in the Gospel of John, the disciples *do not acknowledge that the loaves are with them*, but say, in John, 'There is a lad here who has five barley loaves and two fishes⁴.'"

It must be admitted that John, by omitting Christ's precept to the Twelve, not only greatly lowers the spiritual character of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, but also departs from what appears to be the earliest and most faithful traditions about it. In the Synoptists, the miracle is a kind of firstfruits of the Eucharist, illustrating the Christian Law of Giving. In the Fourth Gospel, it is a kind of last repetition of the old

¹ Origen (Lomm. iii. 69) δι' ἣν ἔδωκε δύναμιν καὶ ἐτέρων θρεπτικὴν τοῖς μαθηταῖς.

² Origen (Lomm. iii. 70) ὅσον μὲν...οὐκ ἐφέροντο. Is it possible that he is referring to Mt. xiv. 18 φέρετέ μοι ὧδε αἰτούς, "bring them hither to me," so that the meaning is "Until they were *brought* by the disciples of Jesus [*to their Master*]?" Ἐφέροντο does not seem a suitable word to mean "*distributed*" by the disciples to the multitudes.

³ Jn vi. 11, omitted in the Arabic Diatessaron.

⁴ Origen (Lomm. iii. 70).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

gift of Manna, and the old gift of the Law, exemplifying the failure of both to satisfy and redeem mankind, and demonstrating the need of a new source of spiritual life¹.

§ 34. "Eating" in the presence of the Lord

We have spoken above of the meal provided by Elisha for a hundred of the sons of the prophets; but some mention should also be made of an earlier Scriptural precedent, when Aaron and two of Aaron's sons and seventy of the elders of Israel went up with Moses, "and they saw the God of Israel...and they beheld God *and did eat and drink*." The latter part of this is paraphrased by Onkelos, "They saw the Glory of the Lord, and *rejoiced in their sacrifices, which were accepted with favour, as though they had eaten and drunk*," but by the Jerusalem Targum, "They saw the glory of the Shekinah of the Lord, and *rejoiced that their oblations were received with favour, and so did eat and drink*²." The passage is frequently referred to in Midrash, where it is mostly implied that Aaron's sons were led into error, perhaps an error of familiarity, in eating and drinking, and were punished for it³. But other passages

¹ If many versions or MSS followed Lk. ix. 13 (codex *a*) "date eis manducare" (omitting "*vos*") we might suppose that textual variations induced John to omit a phrase that meant no more than "give them something to eat." But the omission in codex *a* is so exceptional that nothing can be based on it. And the conclusion seems necessary that John's omission was dictated almost entirely by the feeling that the real Eucharistic "giving" was not understood and indeed was not instituted till after the Resurrection when Jesus gave the command "Feed my sheep."

² Exod. xxiv. 9—11. The Targums are quoted from Etheridge.

³ See Exod. i. (Wü. pp. 38, 317), Lev. i. (Wü. p. 136), Num. i. (Wü. p. 411), Pesikt. (Wü. p. 252). Rashi says *ad loc.* "contemplatant illum curiose (*or, animo elato*) etiam inter edendum ac bibendum, sic interpretatio Tanchumae habet; sed Onkelos non ita interpretatus est." Comp. Lev. x. 8 (Jer. Targ.) "Drink neither wine nor anything that maketh drunk,...as thy sons did, who have died by the burning of fire."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

connect the "eating and drinking" with a "banquet" on "the glory of the Shechinah," quoting from Proverbs "In the light of the King's countenance is life¹." This "banquet," and the "sitting down" with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the aeon that is to come, are referred to in the tradition of Matthew and Luke². Luke also once connects "table" and "covenant" and "thrones" in such a way as to constitute a parallelism between his words and those of the Pentateuch describing the "eating and drinking" of the "nobles" of Israel³; but the parallel Matthew has nothing that suggests a banquet. Nor has Matthew any mention of eating in his parallel to an earlier passage where Luke has "We ate before thee and drank; and in our streets didst thou teach⁴."

In the passage last quoted from Luke, Cyril paraphrases "ate" as the imperfect "*used to eat*," supposing that the words were uttered as an appeal to the Father (not to the Son) and that the words "*ate before thee*" referred to sacrifices eaten in the Temple. But if that had been the meaning, the imperfect

¹ See Taylor's note on *Aboth* iii. 25 "Everything is prepared for the banquet," quoting *Berach.* 17 a, and *Numb.* v. xxi., which says that the ministering angels "are fed on the splendour of the Shechinah, for it is said (Prov. xvi. 15) '*In the light etc.*'" On Prov. xvi. 15 see *Pesikt.* Wü. pp. 70, 140, 252, etc.

² Mt. viii. 11, Lk. xiii. 29.

³ Lk. xxii. 29—30. Comp. Exod. xxiv. 11 "nobles," a noticeable word, LXX ἐπιλέκτων (one of 13 deviations of LXX discussed in the Talmud, see Levy i. 508 a). The parall. Mt. xix. 28 mentions "thrones" and "judging," but has nothing that suggests a banquet.

⁴ Lk. xiii. 26 ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν. The parall. Mt. vii. 22 οὐ τῷ σὺ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν is blended by Origen repeatedly with Lk. so as to drop the difficult phrase ἐνώπιόν σου. Cyril (see Cramer *ad loc.*) explains "*thee*" as "*God*," thus: "How then used they to eat and to drink (ἤσθιον καὶ ἔπινον) in the presence of *God*? By performing the sacrificial-service (λατρείαν) of the Law." And he explains "thou didst teach" as referring to the Scriptures, the word of God, heard by the Jews in the synagogues.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

might have been used by Luke here as elsewhere¹. Nevertheless Cyril is right in supposing that "*ate before thee*" is not the same as "*ate with thee*," and that it suggests some act of a disciple of Christ corresponding to the eating of a sacrifice by an Israelite "in the presence of" Jehovah to whom it is offered. But what act, what "eating," could be meant? The least unsatisfactory explanation, perhaps, is that Luke has placed the words in such a position that they may refer to the "eating" of the Five Thousand, which, according to Mark and Luke, was preceded by "teaching" or something corresponding to teaching (so as to fulfil the saying "*thou hast taught* in our streets²"). That would bring the Lucan tradition into harmony with the Johannine view, that the Five Thousand, for the most part, though they "*ate in the presence of*" Jesus, never truly knew Him or believed in Him. He "taught" in their "streets," but they did not accept the teaching.

We are not, however, on safe ground in attempting to build positive conclusions as to fact on this Lucan passage³. For there may have been other occasions to which "we ate" might definitely refer, *e.g.* the Feeding of the Four Thousand. That Luke does not mention this miraculous act does not exclude the possibility that he collected traditions referring to it although he did not know the reference. And if there were two such miraculous acts why should there not have been three or more—believed to have occurred before the Resurrection? It does not follow that there were only two because Mark has recorded only two, any more than it follows that there was only

¹ Lk. xvii. 27, 28 ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, followed by ἐγάμων and ἡγόραζον. Ἐσθίω is freq. used for habitual or uncompleted eating.

² Mk vi. 34 διδάσκειν, Lk. ix. 11 ἐλάλει περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ.

³ The fact that Matthew deviates from Luke, and the nature of Matthew's deviation, indicate that we have not here actual words of Christ, but early evangelistic explanations, indicating how extremists, on either side, whether anti-judaizers or judaizers, would be rejected by Jesus if they rejected His Spirit.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

one because Luke and John have recorded only one—that is to say, only one before the Resurrection. The Acts of John boldly declares that every meal of the disciples with Jesus, even at a Pharisee's table, was miraculous: "Now if ever, having been invited by one of the Pharisees, He went in compliance with such an invitation, we used to go with Him. And one loaf used to be set by the inviter for each [of the guests], among whom He also used to receive one [and no more]. But He, blessing His [own] loaf, would distribute [it] to us. And from the little [thus distributed] each [of us] used to be filled-to-repletion, and our loaves were kept whole and sound, so that amazement fell on those who invited Him¹."

§ 35. *"That he should give something to the poor,"
in John*

John tells us that after the Last Supper, when Jesus said, "That thou doest, do (R.V.) quickly," some supposed that Jesus meant "Buy what things we have need of for the feast, or, that he should give something to the poor²." Either supposition implies that Judas had been tardy about performing one of two duties that ought seemingly to have been performed before the Supper. We can understand this about the things needed "for the feast"; but how does it apply to the words "that he should give something to the poor"? Was that a duty calling for immediate performance? Only if the duty was connected in the minds of the disciples with the meal at

¹ *Acts of John* § 8. "One loaf (*ἄpros εἷς*)" appears to be meant to be more emphatic than *ἄpros* would have been (without *εἷς*). "One" is emphasized by its position in "among whom He also used to receive *one* [and no more] (*ἐν οἷς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλάμβανεν ἕνα*)." "Filled to repletion," *ἐχορτάζετο* is here used as in the Synoptists, and not in a bad sense (as in *Jn vi. 26*). Incidentally the mention of "one loaf" is important as shewing the smallness of such "loaves" as we read of in the Bible.

² *Jn xiii. 29.*

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

which they were seated. If their Master had habituated them to the practice of giving something to the poor from their common purse on any special occasion when He sat down to a meal with them, in that case—and only in that case—could they suppose that Jesus sent out Judas, the purse-bearer, with something of the nature of a reproach for neglecting the duty to the poor, "That which thou art bound to do, do more quickly¹."

On another occasion, Luke represents Jesus as saying "Now do ye, the Pharisees, cleanse the outside of the cup... but your inner part is full of ravening.... Only *give ye the things that are inside [the vessel] as alms*, and behold, all things are pure unto you²." Here the meaning might be taken to be, literally, "send out some of the food in the dish to the poor and then all that is in the dish is pure." The parallel Matthew has "*Cleanse first the inward part of the cup*," shewing that this literalism ("send out to the poor") would not represent the meaning³. Yet it may represent a part of the meaning. Luke's version may represent a fact, namely, that Jesus was in the habit of giving to the poor either a portion of the meal at which He presided, or else a gift of money in lieu of that portion where the poor were not present in person. This would be a way of teaching the duty inculcated by Isaiah "Draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul⁴."

In view of these passages and of what Philo tells us about the common meal of the *Therapeutae*, we ought not perhaps to put aside the above-quoted grotesque extract from the Acts of John with a mere negation: "Of course there was nothing like this." Of course there was nothing "like this" literally. But

¹ Jn xiii. 27 τὰχιον "more quickly." See *Joh. Gr.* 1918 and Index.

² Lk. xi. 39—41, see *Son* 3362 (iv) a.

³ Mt. xxiii. 26.

⁴ Is. lviii. 10, on the interpretations of which see *Proclam.* p. 312 "It is not to exclude, but to accompany, material giving."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

are we not in danger of failing to realise that there may have been something "like this" spiritually, even before the Eucharist was instituted? Even at the house of a Pharisee where Jesus was but a guest, the disciples might be made by Him to feel that He was still their King, and that "in the light of the king's countenance there was life¹," and that in His doctrine there was the living bread. Much more would this be the case where Jesus was Himself the host and the breaker of the bread. It seems antecedently probable that Jesus would have put into the breaking of the bread, and into the blessing of God over the bread, something beyond the formal Jewish meaning, something that was of the nature of a sacrifice.

In one of the Psalms, what is called by our Revised Version "*the sacrifice of thanksgiving*," is called by the Authorised Version, more simply and more literally, "*thanksgiving*"; and Aquila, too, renders the precept "Sacrifice unto God *eucharist*²." The next Psalm says "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise³." To such a sacrifice Jesus seems to have pointed in His story of the publican who would not so much as lift up his face to heaven but stood afar off saying "God be merciful to me a sinner⁴."

Sorrow for wrong done to one's neighbour goes hand in hand with love and sympathy for one's neighbour; and the awaking consciousness of one's own sins awakens kindness towards others. Jesus is represented by Matthew as twice quoting from Hosea the words "I desire kindness and not

¹ Prov. xvi. 15. See above, p. 156.

² Ps. l. 14 Aq. *θύσον* (זבח) *τῷ θεῷ εὐχαριστίαν* (תורה) (LXX *θύσον τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*). See Gesen. 393 a. "*Acknowledgment*" would be, in many respects, a good rendering of the Hebrew word תורה, since it could include "confession" and (Gesen. 392 b) "*thanksgiving*."

³ Ps. li. 17.

⁴ Lk. xviii. 13, peculiar to Luke.

sacrifice¹," and by Mark as endorsing the saying of a scribe—that to love God and one's neighbour is "better" than sacrifices². Some early Evangelists may have argued: "We, too, we Christians, have a sacrifice. Jesus did not mean that God really desired no sacrifice. The words 'I desire kindness and not sacrifice' are misleading if interpreted apart from the doctrine of Christ as a whole." This may be the reason (or one of the reasons) why Mark and Luke omit the quotation from Hosea, and why Matthew and Luke omit the Marcan tradition. Nevertheless it may be taken as certain that the omitted passages represent Christ's fundamental thought.

§ 36. "*We all partake of the one loaf*"³

One more remains to be added to the allusions inherent in early traditions about Christ's Doctrine of Bread, and about the acts accompanying it. It comes to us stamped with Pauline authority, but very difficult (one would suppose) for Greeks to understand without some knowledge of Jewish customs⁴. Speaking to his Corinthian converts about the Christian Eucharist Paul says "*We all partake of the one loaf.*"

This assumes that "the one loaf" was the emblem of unity and that the Corinthians understood the assumption. There is nothing in Greek literature that points to, or explains, any such notion. But we learn from Maimonides and from a Talmudic tract called *Erubin*, that is, *Communion* or *Mixings*, that the Jews had such a notion and a practice based upon it. The scribes carried it back to Solomon, and the language used by Paul indicates that it was at all events an established practice of the Synagogue in Corinth during the first century.

¹ Mt. ix. 13, xii. 7 quoting Hos. vi. 6.

² Mk xii. 33.

³ 1 Cor. x. 17.

⁴ Acts xviii. 7—17 shews the important part played by the Corinthian Synagogue in connection with the foundation of the Corinthian Church.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Maimonides tells us, in effect, that it is forbidden to neighbours to go [on the sabbath day] from one house to another "unless all the neighbours on the sabbath eve enter into communion (*lit.* make an *Erub* or Mixing)...But how is that communion made? They communicate in one food, which they prepare on the eve of the sabbath, as though they would say, We all communicate, and we have all one food¹." Then he adds that this communion must be made with a whole loaf. Portions, however large they may be, of large loaves, cannot replace the one small loaf however small it may be: "They do not consort together in courts save with a whole loaf²."

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles contains a brief Eucharistic ritual in which what Paul calls "*the loaf that we break*" is briefly called "*the broken [thing]*," or "this which we are breaking³." This is said to be a unique use of the word *clasma*, which in the Gospels and elsewhere means "fragment." Certainly it does not mean "fragment" here. For the ritual continues "As this *clasma* existed [once as seed] scattered abroad (*or*, widely sown) on the hills, and having been gathered together, became one, so let thy Church be gathered together

¹ See *Hor. Heb.* on 1 Cor. x. 17.

² The quotation continues "Although the bread of the batch be a whole *seah*, if it be not a whole loaf, they do not enter into consortship with it. But if it be whole, if it be no more than an *assarius* only, they enter into consortship with it."

"How do they enter into *κοινωνίαν*, communion, in the courts? They demand of every house which is in the court one whole cake or loaf, which they lay up in one vessel, and in some house which is in the court, although it be a barn, or a stable etc. And one of the company blesseth, and so all eat together," etc.

The phrase for "a whole loaf" is פת שלימה בלבר "a loaf complete by itself." Apparently the blessing and breaking would take place over one of these "whole loaves," one representing the whole number.

³ *Didach.* ix. 3 *περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος· Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι...follows πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου· Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι*, implying that "the broken" was a Eucharistic term as familiar to the readers as "the cup."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom¹." This passage, and the Jewish practice of "communion by means of the one loaf," indicate that the word "bread (*or* loaf)" conveyed to Jews suggestions of unity that would be unintelligible to Greeks without explanation.

In the first passage where "bread" is mentioned in the Bible the LXX represents God as saying to Adam "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread²." But the Hebrew omits "thy," and the Targum takes the meaning to be, in effect, "Thou shalt be permitted to eat bread, the food of man, instead of eating the herb of the field, the food of beasts—which was at first the sentence pronounced on thee." The Jews appear to have discerned in a loaf—prepared by the hand of man out of many particles through many processes, sowing, reaping, threshing, grinding, kneading and baking—a unity not apparent in a heap of grass or herbs. This unity seemed a fit symbol of the unifying power that converts individuals into a community, congregation, or church. When and whence this notion came into their literature is perhaps not ascertainable, but that it was current among the Christians of the first century is certain. We ought therefore to be prepared to find a trace of it in the Fourth Gospel.

§ 37. "*Jesus...taketh the loaf and giveth to them*³," in *John*

The Fourth Gospel concludes with a description of Jesus giving a meal in the morning to seven of His disciples who

¹ *Didach.* ix. 4 ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὁρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἓν, οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν. The position of ἦν shews that it is best taken by itself and not as part of a pluperf. "had been scattered." See p. 138, n. 2, for Jerome's saying "seminarium fit ciborum," and see *Son* 3606 *a* for the metaphor of "sowing" Israel.

² Gen. iii. 19.

³ Jn xxi. 13 ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς. On Jn xxi. 9 A.V. "fish...bread," Westcott says "Rather, *a fish... a loaf*.... Compare *ib.* 13 *the fish...the loaf*. The thought of unity

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

have been fishing. The food is first spoken of thus, as being seen by the fishermen disciples who have been fishing: "So when they got out upon the land they see a fire of coals laid and a fish laid thereon and a loaf¹." No mention is made of the source whence the food came. Nor are the fishermen at once invited to partake of it. First they are bidden to draw in the net. They had caught nothing all through the night. But at the dawn, having been instructed to cast the net "on the right side," they have at last caught a draught, and the "at last" is emphasized in the command "Bring of the fish that ye have *now* taken." When this duty is performed they are invited to the morning meal, and then it is said that Jesus "cometh and taketh the loaf and giveth to them and the fish likewise."

Why and whence is Jesus described as "coming"? Is He to be regarded as now coming from a distance although at the beginning of the story He "stood on the beach" and the disciples have now "got out upon the land"? This seems impossible. "Coming" seems superfluous, if taken literally. But it may be taken as the act of "Him that Cometh²," like the Light that "cometh into the world," coming to all the seven collectively and to each individually. Then it becomes intelligible.

Similarly as regards the "taking," we are not to regard the word literally as signifying that He went to the fire and

seems to be distinctly presented." In Jn vi. 11, W. H. read *δίδωκεν* (Tisch. *ἔδωκεν*) but here *δίδωσιν* (*Δ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν*). In Jn xxi. 13, SS has "and Jesus took [the] bread and [the] fish and blessed [God] over them and gave to them."

¹ Jn xxi. 9 *βλέπονσιν ἀνθρακίαν κειμένην καὶ ὀψάριον ἐπικείμενον*. R.V. omits *κειμένην*, or paraphrases it by "there." But in view of John's use of *κείμαι* elsewhere and the contextual *ἐπικείμενον* here, it seems desirable to render the two participles "*laid*" and "*laid hereon*." See below, p. 166 foll.

² On "Him that Cometh" as a name of the Messiah, see *Joh. Voc.* 1633, *Son* 3239—41.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

took off the loaf¹, either once for all the disciples, or seven times for each of them. He "takes" it as the father of any Jewish family might "take" bread in his hands before blessing God and breaking it. In the Feeding of the Five Thousand Jesus is described as "giving separately" or "distributing." Here He simply "gives." What He "gives," whether a part of the loaf or the whole, is not made clear. It would have been easy to make it clear. But the writer leaves it in doubt—with what looks like deliberate purpose—as if to lead us to say "After all, what does it matter? Jesus comes. This must mean He comes to each. He gives. This must mean He gives to each. And what else can He give to us as our bread except Himself? We had a foretaste of this truth in the sign of the barley loaves; and the truth itself is now set forth in this homely farewell breakfast given by the Lord to prepare the disciples to labour for Him after His departure."

If words that at first appear superfluous in this narrative are to be regarded as symbolical or allusive, what symbolical meaning are we to attach to the "*fire of coals laid*"? Why is the word "*laid*" inserted—a word so superfluous (seemingly) that it is left untranslated by our English Versions? And what allusion, if any, exists in the rare word "fire-of-coals"? The Greek for "fire of coals" occurs nowhere else in N.T. except in the Johannine account of Peter's denials. There it is said that the servants of the High Priest had "made" the "*fire of coals*," but here no "maker" or "layer" is mentioned. A supernatural origin is however suggested, like that of the "coals" by the side of Elijah whom "an angel touched," and "he looked, and behold, there was at his head a cake *baken on the coals*²." The Hebrew there rendered "coals" occurs nowhere else except in Isaiah "Then flew one of the seraphim

¹ Apparently the loaf is on the embers. So Nonnus takes it, calling the loaf νέον, "new," and the fire μαραινομένην, *i.e.* dying down.

² 1 K. xix. 6 "coals," marg. "hot stones."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

unto me having a *live coal* in his hand," where the touch of the coal purifies the prophet's lips and prepares him to deliver his message¹. An ancient Christian commentary calls attention to the coincidence that Peter "denied and confessed near a coal fire²." Are we to suppose that it is more than a coincidence, and that the coal fire represents trial or temptation of two kinds:—first, in the High Priest's palace, temptation, for evil, proceeding from men, secondly, by the Sea of Tiberias, temptation, for good³, proceeding from God?

This is perhaps too subtle, even for the author of the Fourth Gospel. But if such a representation were intended we could the better understand that this fire is regarded as "laid," "set," or "appointed." The Greek word is the same as that used in the sayings "The axe is *laid* to the root of the trees⁴," and "This [child] is (lit.) *laid* (R.V. *set*) for the falling and rising up of many in Israel⁵." It is also used by John in connection with the sign of the wine at Cana: "Now there were there stone water-vessels, six [in number], in accordance with the purifying of the Jews, *laid* [*ready*]," that is, *prepared for use, or for Christ's sign*⁶. And the same apparent superfluity and latent mysticism is to be found in the account of the vinegar at the Cross: "After this, Jesus, . . . that the scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst. *A vessel lay* [*ready for*

¹ Is. vi. 6 "*live coal*," marg. "*hot stone*."

² See *Son* 3369 *a* foll.

³ Yet where is the "temptation for good"? May we see it in the question "Lovest thou me *more than these*?" as if it meant "Wilt thou still *set thyself up above the others*, and say, *Though all should stumble yet not I*?" In his reply, Peter does not now give prominence to "I" but to "Thou." That is to say, he makes no profession directly about himself, but appeals to Christ's knowledge ("thou knowest that I love thee").

⁴ Mt. iii. 10, Lk. iii. 9.

⁵ Lk. ii. 34.

⁶ Jn ii. 6 ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ λίθιναι ὑδρίαὶ ἕξ κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμόν τῶν Ἰουδαίων κείμεναι. The *Philocalia* of Origen § 12 (Lomm. xxv. 14) paraphrases this as αἱ ἐπὶ καθαρισμῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὑδρίαὶ κείσθαι λεγόμεναι, but that is only a paraphrase.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the soldiers, or for the fulfilment of scripture] full of vinegar¹." Similarly here the meaning may be that the "coal fire" was "laid" by the hand of God, the sign of that fiery trial through which the soul is to pass into communion with Him. This is a new revelation not given to the Five Thousand. They took the bread of the barley loaves and were filled with it as cattle with fodder. But this bread, or rather this one loaf, comes "*laid above*" fire; and the fire itself is no ordinary one, but fire as from the altar in heaven, "*laid*" by the hand of God.

It should be noted that after Peter and the rest have partaken of this food baked on the coal fire, Peter is warned that he himself will "follow" Jesus on the way of the Cross, dying by crucifixion. If that is to be his fiery trial, the question arises whether in early Christian literature there are any traces of a comparison between martyrdom and the baking of bread baked on the coals. There is something of the kind in the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp. He was burned alive, and the martyr's body is said to have emitted a fragrant odour like that of "*bread that is being baked*²." Eusebius omits this; but there can hardly be a doubt that he omits it, not as a corrupt reading but in fear that the detail might shock his readers. The fear was (doubtless) well grounded in the days of Constantine. But when the Church was not yet established, and while it was still being watered with the blood of martyrs, passionate metaphor was natural and necessary. Clement of Alexandria not only uses language resembling that rejected by Eusebius, but also applies it to Christ Himself. Commenting on the words of Jesus "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world," Clement implies that the "*flesh*" must be prepared by "*fire*" to become the food of the world. Then, playing on the double meaning of

¹ Jn xix. 29 σκεῦος ἔκειτο ὄξους μεστόν. Nonnus "there was ready (ἐτοῖμον ἦν)."

² Polyc. Mart. § 15 ὡς ἄπρος ὀπτώμενος (v.r. ὀπτόμενος) is omitted (Lightf.) by Eusebius.

the Greek *puros*, i.e. "fire" or "wheat," he introduces the thought of the wheat rising up in a kind of resurrection, and likens it at the same time to "bread that is being baked¹." Aesthetically such language may be repellent, but it will be of use if it leads us to think how very much is implied by the author of the Fourth Gospel, for himself and for those who are in sympathy with him, by the vision of "the fire of coals" and that which was "laid thereon."

§ 38. Christ's "leaven"

This loaf that is seen, along with the fish, on "the coal fire²," is it to be supposed to be leavened or unleavened? The same question applies to the "one loaf" that the disciples had with them when they were told to "beware of leaven³." Tertullian implies a connection of "leaven" with fire through the "oven" in which bread is baked⁴. He is referring to Christ's saying that the Kingdom of God "is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till it was all leavened⁵"; but he does not explain to us the nature of this "leaven," or its relation to "the leaven of the Pharisees." Ignatius recognises a "new leaven" as appertaining to Christ⁶.

¹ Clem. Alex. 125 ἐνταῦθα τὸ μυστικὸν τοῦ ἄρτου παρασημειωτέον, ὅτι σάρκα αὐτὸν λέγει καὶ ὡς ἀνισταμένην δῆθεν διὰ πυρὸς, καθάπερ ἐκ φθορᾶς καὶ σπορᾶς ὁ πυρὸς ἀνίσταται, καὶ μέντοι διὰ πυρὸς συνισταμένην εἰς εὐφροσύνην ἐκκλησίας ὡς ἄρτον πεπτόμενον.

² Jn xxi. 9.

³ Mk viii. 15.

⁴ Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* (on Lk. xiii. 21) "fermentationem quoque congruere...regno Creatoris quia post illam clibanus vel furnus gehennae sequatur." See context. Is he referring to Hosea vii. 4?

⁵ Mt. xiii. 33 ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ζύμη ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία ἕως οὗ ἐξυμώθη ὅλον, sim. Lk. xiii. 21.

⁶ Ign. *Magn.* § 10 ὑπέρθεσθε οὖν τὴν κακὴν ζύμην τὴν παλαιωθεῖσαν καὶ ἐνοξίσασαν, καὶ μεταβάλεσθε εἰς νέαν ζύμην, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. On this, Lightf. quotes 1 Cor. v. 7 "purge out the old leaven," but gives no instance of "new leaven." He adds "On the metaphor generally see the note Galatians v. 9." In that note, he says "The

Justin Martyr recognises a "*new leaven*" as the opposite of the "*old*" Egyptian "*leaven*," which was to be superseded by the "*new*," after the brief interval of the week of unleavened bread¹. It is possible that this aspect of Christ's doctrine—implying an antithesis between "*old leaven*" and "*new leaven*," between "*bad leaven*" and "*good leaven*"—was overshadowed by the Pauline antithesis between "*leaven*" and "*the unleavened*"². At all events it is a significant fact that in the writings of the early Christian Fathers and Apologists the words "*leaven*" and "*unleavened*" do not occur except in

leaven of Scripture is always a symbol of evil, with the single exception of the parable (Matt. xiii. 33, Luke xiii. 20, 21), as it is for the most part also in rabbinical writers: see Lightfoot on Matt. xvi. 6 and Schöttgen on 1 Cor. v. 6."

But "for the most part" would be misleading if it led the reader to suppose that either Lightfoot (*i.e.* the author of *Horae Hebraicae*) or Schöttgen quotes, from "rabbinical writers," a single instance of "*leaven*" in a good sense. Nor does Wetstein quote one. Nor is any alleged in the Biblical Dictionaries of Black and Hastings ("*Leaven*"). Dr A. Büchler informs me that he has been unable to find any such instance.

¹ Justin (*Tryph.* § 14) is bold enough to say to the Jews "Wherefore also, after the seven days of eating unleavened bread, God commanded you to knead for yourselves *new leaven*, that is to say, the doing of other works and not the imitation of those that were old and vile." He has previously said (*ib.*) "For this is the symbol of the unleavened, [being intended] in order that ye may not do the old deeds of the evil leaven."

² 1 Cor. v. 6 foll. "Know ye not that a little *leaven* leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are *unleavened*. For our passover also hath been sacrificed, [even] Christ; wherefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the *unleavened bread* of sincerity and truth."

If Paul had been asked "But what are we to do during the rest of the Christian Year, after keeping the Christian Passover? Are we never to partake of the bread described by our Lord as 'wholly leavened'?" he would doubtless have replied "Yes." But he deals with a different aspect of the metaphor, as if Christians were always keeping their Passover.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the two passages quoted above from Ignatius and Justin Martyr, and in one other instance where Justin says to the Jews "If ye eat *unleavened* bread ye say that ye have fulfilled the will of God¹." Perhaps one reason why the doctrine of Christ's leaven fell into the background was that among Gentiles, as well as among Jews, there was a feeling that leaven was corrupt and impure². Another reason may have been that Christ's doctrine was obscured by superabundant allegorism³.

¹ Justin *Tryph.* § 12.

² See Lightf. on Gal. v. 9, "Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 109 (p. 289 E), in answer to the question why the Flamen Dialis was not allowed to touch leaven, explains it, ἡ ζύμη καὶ γέγονεν ἐκ φθορᾶς αὐτῇ καὶ φθείρει τὸ φύραμα μὲνυμένην."

³ Jerome, on Mt. xiii. 33, gives three explanations of it, and says that he has not space for others. Many of them might deal with the allegorical meaning of the "three measures of meal," on which see Clem. Alex. 694. The N.T. ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἀλείρου σάτα τρία might invite comparison with Gen. xviii. 6 (Aq. Syn.) τρία σάτα σεμιδάλεως (al. exempl. τρία μέτρα ἀλείρου σεμιδάλεως) καὶ ποιήσον ἐγκρυφίας, on which Philo has much to say. Clem. Alex. 603—4 (following Philo) connects Gen. xviii. 6 ἐγκρυφίας, "cakes hidden [in the embers]" with a mystical "hiding," and subsequently quotes Mt. xiii. 33 ἐνέκρυψεν, referring to the threefold nature of man.

The doctrine of "good leaven" and "bad leaven" seems to imply the pre-existence of a food that can be assimilated to good or evil. Elsewhere Jesus speaks of a "good eye" and an "evil eye," and of an antagonism, or want of harmony, between "the flesh" and "the spirit," and implies (Mk xiv. 38, Mt. xxvi. 41, but not Lk.) that man can control the evil or the weakness. Some of these expressions may be illustrated by a very ancient Jewish doctrine about a "good" and a "bad" *nature* in man. See *Aboth* iv. 2 "Who is mighty? He that subdues *his nature* (יצורו)" (Taylor's note). The Heb. *yetser* (Gesen. 428) meant "*form, framing, purpose*," occurring for the first time in Gen. vi. 5 "every *imagination* of the thoughts of his [man's] heart was only evil." It means, in New Heb., "*impulse*" or "*tendency*" (Gesen. "good or bad tendency in man"). Levy gives abundant instances of the New Heb. use, and (ii. 258) of the fem. יצירה meaning the earthly and the heavenly shaping ("Bildung") of man. *Inter alia* it quotes *j. Jeb.* iv. 5^c "zwei Bildungen

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

And yet is it not in accordance with the simple homeliness and restfulness of Christ's doctrines that He should have raised a protest for leaven as an emblem of quiet and unobtrusive growth, and for leavened bread as a homely and pleasant gift of God? Luke places the parables of leaven and mustard seed after the sabbath cure of the "daughter of Abraham." The ruler of the synagogue reproved the act. Jesus said to him and his abettors, "Ye hypocrites¹!" He implies that they were defiled with "the leaven of the Pharisees,"—a hypocritical zeal, a sin against the light, in placing the literal prohibitions of the Law of Leviticus above the dictates of natural humanity. God, in Nature, works not so much by repressing as by developing. And this Jesus proceeded to shew by the parables of the mustard seed, and of the leaven fermenting in the loaf. The leaven was kindness, divine kindness, passing from the Father in heaven to His children and from His children to one another.

An instance of what Paul might have called "*the leaven of the Pharisees*" may be found in the record of the proceedings

des Menschen, nämł. zuerst innerhalb dreier Tage nach Empfang des Samens, und dann nach 40wöchiger Schwangerschaft."

Ign. *Magn.* § 10, after the words "*new leaven* which is Jesus Christ," continues, "*Be salted* (ἀλίσθητε) in Him, lest any one among you grow putrid (διαφθαρή) since from your savour ye will be detected (ἐλεγχθήσθε)"—which alludes to Mk ix. 49—50 (comp. Mt. v. 13, Lk. xiv. 34) "for everyone shall be salted with fire." On the other hand Justin Martyr (*Tryph.* § 14) before mentioning "*new leaven*," discourses on "*baptism*," and "*the water of life*"—not the "living water" that satisfies spiritual thirst, but the "water of life" regarded as washing away spiritual defilement. Both writers illustrate the variety of metaphor with which early Christians, following the earliest traditions of their Master's words, inculcated the doctrine of spiritual regeneration, and they lead to the conclusion that this doctrine was very much more in His thoughts than we might have inferred from the Synoptic Gospels, and from the absence of any continuous discourse about it in the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke (commonly called "Q").

¹ Lk. xiii. 15.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

of the Council of Jerusalem. After the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles to the Church by Peter, in accordance with a revelation from the Lord, "There arose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed, saying, It is needful to circumcise them, and to charge them to keep the law of Moses¹." Paul did not speak on this occasion. But, had he spoken, it would probably have been to this effect: "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love.... This persuasion [cometh] not from him that calleth you. *A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*²." This "little leaven" is leaven in a bad sense. Why cannot we point to mentions of "*a little leaven*" in a good sense? Perhaps because this metaphor was too cosmopolitan for many Jews and too homely and original for many Gentiles. But these very reasons are reasons for believing that it originated from Jesus Himself—more alive than His disciples to the quiet and unobtrusive influences of beneficent Nature.

These considerations indicate that the whole of the Mark-Matthew comparison between the Feeding of the Five Thousand and that of the Four Thousand may have been omitted by Luke, not because he disbelieved that there had been such a comparison, but because he believed that it referred to a period after Christ's resurrection. The disciples may have received at that time some revelation about the admission of the Gentile element into the Church, such a revelation as Peter received at Joppa. A voice may have come to them from Jesus, warning them against the "leaven" of "the Pharisees," the leaven of exclusiveness and unkindness, and reminding them that all alike, Jews and Gentiles, must feed on a bread that was not unleavened but was leavened with the "new leaven" of "faith working through love." The circumstances of the two acts of feeding were different, but the

¹ Acts xv. 5.

² Gal. v. 6—9.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

principle was the same. As the Apostles, when ministering to the twelve tribes of Israel, received correspondently twelve *cophinoi* of fragments, so, when ministering to the multitude of the Gentiles, who came from the four quarters of the world, they received seven *sphurides*, a number that would correspond to "the seven Spirits of God" and "the seven Churches," mentioned in Revelation. The "five loaves" of the Law were broken for the former; the "seven" loaves of the Spirit for the latter. But the loaves were broken by one and the same Lord. The difference did not prevent the recognition of the fact that all alike, Jews and Gentiles, partook of the "one loaf."

§ 39. *The passionateness of the Eucharist*

In the foregoing investigation the main object has been to ascertain, not what was the fact, but what was believed to be the fact by the Evangelists, and especially in those narratives where Luke omitted or altered something that was in Mark. And we have been led to the conclusion that Mark contains traces—not found in Luke and rarely found in Matthew—of early Eucharistic doctrine taught by Christ before the institution of the Eucharist. John appears to have cleared away what obscured those traces so that they shew something like a path, which he has broadened and lengthened into a highway running right through his Gospel. But this path or highway may guide us to the actual and historical fact.

Among the Jews it was customary for the father of the family, at the commencement of a family meal, to take up a loaf and to bless God over it and break it. This practice Jesus appears to have adopted, breathing into it a new spiritual meaning and a passionateness of His own. It was not enough, He might say, to lift up and break the loaf. We must, as Jeremiah said, "lift up our heart with our hands unto God in the heavens¹," and the best way to lift up the heart to God

¹ Lam. iii. 41.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the Father in the breaking of bread was to do something from one's heart for His children that had no bread. This something was not to be the mere giving of alms for the sake of reward. Such alms (Jesus declared) the Pharisaean formalists gave. They allowed a conventional religion of rules to drive out the natural morality of the conscience. They encouraged a son to withhold a *Corban* from his needy parents in order to give it to God. But Christ's religion was to be of the heart, and His almsgiving was to be a "drawing out" of the "soul" to the hungry¹, a suffering with their sufferings, an action that partook of the nature of sacrifice.

It is not definitely recorded that Jesus ever carried out these precepts in a literal way by summoning the poor to His table and giving them food, or by sending them food or money before sitting down to table². Jesus had no house, no "table," that He could call His own. But all the Evangelists agree that on one occasion, out in "the wilderness," He (so to speak) extemporised a "table" for a hungry multitude. Mark and Matthew add that He did this on a second occasion. John relates that He did this, after the Resurrection, on a third occasion. In the apocryphal Acts of John it is said that He did this habitually for His disciples even when He and they were in the house of a stranger.

There is a striking difference between Mark and Luke in one of these traditions about Jesus and His disciples at their common meal. Whereas Luke represents Jesus as saying to His disciples "Who is greater, he that sitteth at meat or he that serveth [at table]? . . . But I am in the midst of you as he that serveth [at table]," Mark represents Him as saying "The Son of man came not to be served [at table] but to serve [at table], and to give his life (*or*, soul) a ransom for many."

¹ Is. lviii. 10.

² See, however, p. 158 foll., on Jn xiii. 29 "that he should give something to the poor."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Also the occasions differ. Luke places the words much later than Mark, as being actually uttered at table, during the Last Supper¹.

John deals with these traditions in a simple, concrete, and dramatic way. Perhaps he knew that Mark's noun "servant [at table]," *diaconos*, or "deacon"—omitted by Luke—was liable to be confused with the Christian official "deacon"². At all events he first uses the noun concerning the "*servants [at table]*" in Cana who draw the water that becomes wine³. Then he uses the verb concerning Martha's literal, homely, waiting at table "*Martha was serving [at table]*"⁴. Then, in the Temple on the morrow, when Jesus has heard that "certain Greeks" desire to see Him, there is a noteworthy change in the use of the word. The Law of the spiritual Harvest, and of Life through Death, is proclaimed as if it were also the Law of the Feast, or Joy, or Table, in Heaven, at which Table no soul is admitted to feast until it has first "*waited*," or "*served*," and he that desires thus to "*serve*" must be willing to lose his life: "He that loveth his life loseth (*or*, destroyeth) it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal. If any one *is bent on serving me [at my table]* let him follow me, and where I am there also shall be *my servant [that serves at my table]*. If any one *is bent on serving me [at my table]*, him will my Father honour⁵."

This is the last Johannine instance of the word "serve [at table]" either as noun or as verb, but John proceeds to dramatize the *thing* by representing Jesus as actually "serving [at table]," during the Last Supper, girding Himself with a towel and washing the feet of the disciples. This no other Evangelist has related. In previous parts of this series the

¹ Mk x. 45, Lk. xxii. 27.

² *Proclam.* p. 404.

³ Jn ii, 5, 9.

⁴ Jn xii. 2. Comp. Lk. x. 40 "Martha was distracted (*περιεσπῆτο*) about much *serving [at table]* (*διακονίαν*)."

⁵ Jn xii. 25—6. See *Joh. Gr.* 2552 c.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

question has been discussed whether John's narrative of this particular act of "serving at table" can be accepted as literally true in spite of its omission by the Synoptists, and the opinion was expressed that the event was probably historical even if it did not occur on that particular occasion¹. This opinion has been confirmed by further study revealing, through many sources, but especially through Mark and John, traces of early passionate feeling, expressed in passionate words, concerning the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and details connected with it. Some of these expressions might be omitted or softened in later days.

§ 40. *The "kiss of love"*

It is of the utmost importance that we, Christians, should recall as far as possible this Christian passionateness, so far as it came from Christ Himself. The details of the Miracles of Feeding—the "taking" and "blessing" and "breaking," and the question whether the "breaking" may be metaphorical as well as literal, meaning the dividing and distribution of the word of God—are all subordinate to the realisation of the spirit of the common meal which we call the Eucharist, and to the question of the origin of that spirit. Hence, in conclusion, a few words of apparent digression from the Miracles of Feeding in the Gospels to the thought of the Eucharist as it is discerned in the Epistles, may really be no digression at all, but a return to the essence of our subject. Now among the accompaniments of the Eucharist (or of Christian gatherings) most frequently mentioned in the Epistles is the "kiss." Paul speaks of "a holy kiss," Peter of "a kiss of love" wherewith Christians are to salute one another². Whence did this spring?

¹ See *Son* 3276 a (and Index, "Washing") and the references there given.

² Rom. xvi. 16, 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 26, ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ (and comp. 1 Pet. v. 14 ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης). The meaning might be "with the holy kiss," or "the kiss of love." The long article on "Kiss" in Smith's *Dict. Antiq.* ii. 902—6 contains

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

We find nothing alleged from Jewish or Gentile practice that explains it¹. It is true that Jesus is represented as saying reproachfully to a Pharisee at whose table He is sitting as a guest "Thou gavest me no kiss²"; but no commentator (so far as I know) shews that the kiss was a mere courtesy among the Jews—a courtesy expected by guests from their host as a matter of course. Has Luke been misled by the special practice of Christians? Did Jesus introduce it among His disciples as a sign that they belonged to the Family of God?

It was a practice open to obvious abuse. Only the earlier Pauline Epistles and the first Epistle of Peter contain the precept to salute after this fashion. Clement of Alexandria complains of the abuse of it between the sexes³. Athenagoras is said to quote an apocryphal precept of caution about it⁴.

no mention or suggestion of any Jewish or Gentile origin or precedent for the Christian rite.

¹ On Rom. xvi. 16 (on which Wetstein and Schöttgen give no help) Fritzsche has a long note, and Lightfoot has one on 1 Thess. v. 26. But they give no illustration from Jewish usage. Nor is there any light thrown by Hamburger i. 685, or Levy iii. 453—4 where different kinds of kisses are distinguished.

² Lk. vii. 45. On this *Hor. Heb.* is silent, as also on 1 Cor. xvi. 20 "a holy kiss."

³ Clem. Alex. 301 "The shameless use of the kiss, which ought to be mystic, occasions foul suspicions and evil reports."

⁴ Athenagoras *Apolog.* § 32. This is important because if (as the translator in Clark's translation suggests) Athenagoras is quoting "probably from some apocryphal writing," the testimony takes us back to a period even earlier, and perhaps much earlier, than A.D. 177: "For the Logos again says to us 'If anyone kiss a second time because it has given him pleasure [he sins],' adding, Therefore the kiss, or rather the salutation, should be given with the greatest care (οὕτως οὖν ἀκριβώσασθαι τὸ φίλημα μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ προσκύνημα δεῖ)...". Here the correction of "kiss" into *προσκύνημα*, implying an act of homage or "worship" (in the old English sense), and the precept to "be precise about it (ἀκριβώσασθαι)," prove that the author of this early saying is referring to what Paul and Peter call "the holy kiss" or "kiss of love." He seems to regard it as almost equivalent to an act of homage or love to Christ, as the Lord and the Beloved,

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Athenagoras is defending the Christians against the charge of practising promiscuous intercourse, and he declares that, so far from doing this, they recognise fellow-believers as being spiritually blood relations according to age, sons or daughters, brothers or sisters, fathers or mothers; and he bids us recognise "the kiss or rather the obeisance" as the symbol of family affection. Similarly the Jews, excusing the "kiss" given by Jacob to Rachel, added to the three lawful kinds of kissing a fourth, namely, the kiss between blood relations¹. Now the Synoptic Gospels tell us that Jesus introduced as it were a relationship of blood between all His disciples, including them in His own relations when He said "Who is my mother and my brethren? And looking round on them that sat round about him, he saith, Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother²."

The parallel Luke—which has been discussed elsewhere³—omits this last phrase where "sister" is added to "brother." John has nothing of the kind verbally. But if, by "brother" and "sister," we mean "beloved as a brother" and "beloved as a sister," then we may say that by implication John did not shrink from including sisters as well as brothers in the newly instituted Family of Christ. He does this as usual in a dramatic and concrete form. The sisters of Lazarus, he says, "sent to Jesus, saying, Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is

paid invisibly to Him when paid visibly to the brethren and sisters who are members of His Body.

¹ See Gen. xxix. 11 and *Gen. v. ad loc.*, also *Exod. v. on Exod. iv. 27*, and *Levy iii. 453 b*. The other three lawful kinds were (1) "the kiss of magnifying (גדולה) or glorifying," given by Samuel to Saul (1 S. x. 1), (2) "the kiss of meeting [after long absence]" (*Exod. iv. 27*), (3) "the kiss of separation" (*Ruth i. 14*).

² Mk iii. 33—5, Mt. xii. 48—50, comp. Lk. viii. 21.

³ The exact details of the parallelism are somewhat complicated. See *Proclamation* p. 470 foll.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

sick¹." Then he adds, "Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus"; and he represents the tears of Martha's sister as preceding, and in part causing, tears from Jesus, and thus as preceding (and perhaps preparing for) the raising of Lazarus².

Lucian is the only writer of literary Greek quoted in the Thesaurus as using the expression "salute with a kiss," and the context shews how bad an impression the connection of such a phrase with Christian worship might produce on Gentiles³. Philo would certainly not have approved of it, for he expatiates on the frequent falseness of this "superficial welcoming," and is at great pains to distinguish the Greek, *philēma*, "kiss," literally "act of love," from *philiā*, "love" (or "friendship")⁴. Thus no Greek source presents itself for this Christian custom. And we have seen above that no Jewish source presents itself either, except in special conditions. We are driven to the conclusion that in some way one or more of those "special conditions" was fulfilled. Now one of these "special conditions" was blood-relationship. That, as we have seen, Christ might be said to have introduced among

¹ Jn xi. 3.

² Jn xi. 5, 33 foll.

³ See Lucian ii. 248 *Alex.* § 41 *φιλήματι ἀσπάξασθαι*, and *οἱ ἐν τῷ τοῦ φιλήματος*, i.e. "those who were included in [the circle of those honoured with] a kiss," about a monster of sensuality, named Alexander. Possibly Lucian regarded Alexander as having borrowed from the Christians (though Alexander was opposed to them) this detail of their worship, and as having perverted it. A preceding chapter (*ib.* § 38) says that Alexander began his "mysteries" by proclaiming "Out with the Christians!"

Reasons of seemliness may have combined with textual reasons to induce John to omit the Synoptic tradition that Judas "betrayed with a kiss (קֶשֶׁת)." See *Son* 3326 c, and add Ps. cxl. 7 "day of battle (קֶשֶׁת)," explained (Levy iii. 453 a) by some as "arming" against the Messiah. This is more probable than the Greek corruption suggested in *Paradosis* 1365.

⁴ Philo i. 478—9 *φίλημα δὲ διαφέρει τοῦ φιλεῖν*. A "kiss" he calls *ἐπιπόλαιον δεξιῶσιν*.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

His disciples. Another condition was consecration. This, too, might be regarded as proceeding from Christ's lips when He was present in the Eucharist. Another was either parting or return after absence. This would be fulfilled with special reality when Jesus, after the Resurrection, fulfilled His promise, "I will see you again, and your joy no man taketh from you." When He came thus to "see" them "again," it is said by John that He "breathed into them" and said "Receive ye the Holy Spirit¹." Perhaps this might be regarded as, in some sense, the "kiss" of Christ. According to Jewish tradition, God "kissed" Moses when He drew forth his soul in a peaceful death². That might be called a kiss of parting, the work of life on earth being over. But the name might also be given to the kiss of return, when the Lord prepared His disciples for the work of the Gospel, touching their lips and comforting their hearts with the kiss of the Holy Spirit. And the disciples, having once received this kiss from their Master at their first Eucharist after the Resurrection, may have henceforth passed on the salutation from one to another at every Eucharist, as being the kiss "of love" and "holy³."

¹ See *Son* 3623 g—j on Jn xx. 22 ἐνεφύσησε.

² Deut. xxxiv. 5 Jer. Targ. Miriam also (*M. Kat.* 28 a) died by "God's kiss," Abraham (*Test. Abr.* § 20) by kissing the hand of the Angel of Death.

³ The thought of the *philēma*, or "kiss," as proceeding from Jesus leads us to the thought of the title *philoī*, or "friends," used by Jesus about His disciples. Luke is the only one of the Synoptists who represents Jesus as using it thus:—

Mt. x. 27—8

"What ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the housetops; and be not afraid of them that kill the body...."

Lk. xii. 3—4

"What ye have spoken in the ear in the inner chambers shall be proclaimed upon the housetops; and *I say unto you my friends*, Be not afraid of them that kill the body...."

In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus explains (Jn xv. 13—15) what He means when He says to the disciples "Ye are *my friends*." Friendship may imply dying for one's friend ("Greater love hath no man

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Even if we reject this explanation some of us may be benefited by being compelled to confess that there is beneath this ancient Christian rite something that needs to be explained. The explanation, whatever it may be, appears to involve the recognition of a personality in Jesus even more marvellous than we had supposed. Many believe easily enough in Christ's material miracles who do not realise His spiritual, social, and (so to speak) revolutionary miracles wrought on human nature. This "holy kiss" seems to represent a kind of high-water mark, reached at one rush by the religion of Christ during the period that followed His death, and perhaps to be reached again, after an interval of many centuries hereafter, but in a different way. Then it was reached by a visible Presence and an audible Voice. Hereafter the Presence may be not visible, and the Voice not audible, to the bodily sense. But in either case the Spirit will be the same, human yet divine, cosmopolitan yet homely, the Spirit of the Family of God breathed into God's children by God's Son¹.

than this") but such death is not a condition: "Ye are *my friends* if ye do the things that I command you." The term "*Caesar's friend*" was known to the mob (Jn xix. 12) in Jerusalem. Epictetus uses it repeatedly in his lecture on Freedom (iv. 1. 8—95) bidding his pupils not to seek freedom by gaining admission to the circle of "*Caesar's friends*" but (*ib.* 98) to "attach themselves to God." Luke's tradition, taken with the context ("kill the body") enables us to understand that there would be a tendency in the Christian Church to call the martyrs "*Christ's friends*" in a special sense.

The conclusion of the Fourth Gospel (Jn xxi. 15—22) neutralises such a tendency. It shews that Peter, the future Martyr on the Cross, had no precedence in the matter of friendship, over the silent disciple "whom Jesus loved." The proof of Peter's affection demanded by Jesus is not expressed in an imperative "Then die for me," but in "Feed my sheep." In 3 Jn 14 (15), the expressions "*The friends salute thee*," and "*salute the friends*," are probably to be explained (from Jn xv. 14) as meaning "*the friends of the Lord [with me]*" and "*the friends of the Lord [with thee]*" (not "my friends" and "thy friends").

¹ Attention has been called (*Joh. Voc.* 1697, and Index) to the

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 41. "Testament" or "Covenant"

The last two sections bear less directly on the miracles of feeding than on what appears to be their outcome. What follows will depart still further from the miracles and will turn itself toward the Eucharist. Not that we must permit ourselves to discuss so important a subject here out of its place. But in fact all the preceding forty sections have been leading us up, through the words "Give ye them to eat," to the question "What was Jesus Himself preparing to give us to eat?" Consequently, in taking our leave of the miracles of feeding, some reply to this question seems demanded.

fact that Mark never uses the word ἀγάπη. Hermas, who frequently resembles Mark, mentions ἀγάπη as a virtue thrice, twice connecting it with "understanding (φρόνησις)":—(*Sim.* ix. 17) "Having therefore received the seal, they had *one understanding*, and one mind, and their faith became one, and their *love one*," (*ib.* 18) "the church of God shall be one body, *one understanding*, one mind, one faith, *one love*." But he also uses it as a proper noun to denote the last of the Angels that build up the Church (*Vis.* iii. 8 (*his*), comp. *Sim.* ix. 15). And here he regards it as proceeding "from Understanding," called Ἐπιστήμη. Ἀγάπη is called by the Greek Thesaurus "a mere Biblical word (vox mere biblica)." In LXX it is almost confined to Cant. and almost always has a sexual significance, but the Wisdom of Solomon applies it to man's love of God (iii. 9) and says that the beginning of wisdom is the desire of discipline, and (vi. 18) "the care (φροντίς) of discipline is *love*, and *love* is the keeping of her laws (ἀγάπη δὲ τήρησις νόμων αὐτῆς)." Comp. Jn xiv. 23 "if a man love me he will keep (τηρήσει) my word."

The Fourth Evangelist does not mention the noun "love" (Jn v. 42 "I know you, how that ye have not *the love of God* within you") till he has prepared his readers for it by connecting the verb with God as loving (iii. 16, 35) "the world" and "the Son." After that one mention of the noun, it is not mentioned again till the night before the Crucifixion where it is, in effect, defined (xiii. 34—5, xv. 9 foll.) as a unique love personified by Christ. The Gospel manifests not only a spiritual struggle to express an inexpressibly divine emotion, but also an intellectual attempt to rescue the word ἀγάπη from its Old Testament associations.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

We have seen above that John omits the words "Give ye them to eat." But we have been led to the conclusion that they were part of the earliest form of the narrative. If that is so, Jesus (we may suppose) was, even in those early days, training the disciples to "give" to the multitude, as, later on, He Himself was destined to "give" to the disciples in the Eucharist. What was that "gift"? As to part of it, all the Synoptists are agreed. They all tell us that He "gave" it with the words "This is my body." About this we shall say nothing here, since there is no disagreement. But as to another part there is a difference. Mark and Matthew indisputably represent Jesus as connecting the words "my blood" with a word (*diathēkē*) variously translated by our English Versions "covenant" or "testament," so that Jesus says "This is the blood of my *covenant* (or, *testament*)¹." Luke, in one version of his text, the one adopted by our Revised Version, has "This cup is the new *covenant* (or, *testament*) in my blood." But Westcott and Hort place this (and some of the context) in double brackets, as not being a part of the original text². Thus we are led to narrow down our question about the "gift" to a question, in the first place, as to the meaning attached by Jesus to the word *diathēkē*.

In LXX, the word *diathēkē* occurs for the first time in connection with the deluge by which God purposed to destroy mankind but to spare Noah: "Everything that is in the earth shall die, but I will establish my *covenant* with thee³." The

¹ Mk xiv. 24, Mt. xxvi. 28. Or the meaning may be (as R.V.) "This is my blood of the *covenant* (or, *testament*).¹" The Greek is τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης.

² Lk. xxii. 20. Curet. omits this. SS combines xxii. 17, 20 thus "...divide it among you; this is my blood, the new *testament*." For "*testament*," SS uses דִּיאָתִיקָא, a Syriac form of the Greek διαθήκη, which is regularly used for "testamentary disposition," "will" (*Thes. Syr.* 873). The word for "covenant," e.g. with Noah, Abraham, Israel, etc., is represented by Syr. קִיּוּמָא = Heb. בְּרִית (*Thes. Syr.* 3534).

³ Gen. vi. 17—18.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Hebrew for "covenant" is *berîth*, meaning "compact," "alliance," "league," "agreement," "pledge of friendship." This is often well expressed by "covenant"—as when Joshua made a "covenant" with the Gibeonites at the time when he was purposing to destroy the Canaanites¹. But in the case of Noah's *berîth*, as also often elsewhere, Aquila and Symmachus both substitute *sunthêkê* for *diathêkê*². And they appear to be justified. For *sunthêkê*, in Greek, regularly has the meanings of the Hebrew *berîth*, that is, "compact," "agreement," etc.; *diathêkê* has not. The regular meaning of *diathêkê*—outside LXX and outside writings influenced by LXX—is "*last will and testament*"³.

¹ Josh. ix. 6—16, see Gesen. 136.

² They also substitute *συνθήκη* for LXX *διαθήκη* in Gen. xvii. 2 (the *BERÎTH* with Abraham). There Jerome says "Notandum quod ubicumque in Graeco *testamentum* legimus, ibi in Hebraeo sermone sit *foedus*, sive *pactum*, id est *BERÎTH*." Field, on Is. lvi. 6 (one of the very few instances where Aq. and Sym. are recorded to have used *διαθήκη*), says "Pro *διαθήκη* juxta usum binorum interpretum requiritur *συνθήκη*."

³ The only instance known to me of *διαθήκη* meaning "*agreement*," in Greek outside the sphere of LXX influence, is one quoted by Wetstein (on Mt. xxvi. 28) from Aristophanes (*Av.* 439). This is mentioned by Lightfoot (on Gal. iii. 15) as one of "some few exceptions." Westcott, who writes later, does not add any of these "exceptions" in his very long note on *Diathêkê* in *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. He says merely (p. 301) "The more general sense of 'arrangement,' 'agreement' is also found (*Arist. Av.* 440)." But Steph. *Thes.* gives no instance of "the more general sense" except the one from Aristophanes.

Josephus (*Ant.* xvii. 3. 2, xvii. 9. 7, *Bell.* ii. 2. 3) not only uses *diathêkê* several times for a "will," but also avoids using it in the phrase "the ark of the covenant," as, for example, in describing the passage of the Jordan by Joshua, and the capture of Jericho, where the phrase recurs frequently in Scripture. Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with the Jew, where he frequently quotes LXX, uses *διαθήκη* more than thirty times; but in his Apology, addressed to Greeks, he does not use it once; *De Monarch.* ii. 3 quotes from the *Diathêkai* of Orpheus, apparently regarded as meaning "*last instructions*"—a testamentary recantation. Hermas never uses *diathêkê*.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Philo affords conclusive evidence that the LXX application of the Greek *diathēkē* to the "covenants" of God with Noah and Abraham caused difficulty to students of the Greek text. Unfortunately his Greek comment on the *berîth* with Noah is lost. When referring, however, to the *berîth* with Abraham, he says "*Diathēkai* are written for the sake of those who are worthy of a free gift, so that a *diathēkē* is a symbol of grace¹." Then he says "About the whole subject of *diathēkai* I have written fully in two lectures, and I pass over the subject to avoid repeating myself." But he adds something that indicates (although briefly and obscurely) a connection in his mind between the *diathēkē* with Abraham and the "*inheritance*" promised to Abraham². "To one class of men," he says, "God holds forth benefits through earth, water, air, sun, moon, sky, [and] other incorporeal powers³,

¹ Philo i. 586 "a free gift (δωρεάς)." This appears directed against the view that the *diathēkē* was a "compact," or "agreement." As a fact, the Hebrew, *berîth*, does mean "compact." But the Greek διαθήκη does not.

² It should be noted that the Hebrew verb "*inherit* (ירש)" occurs for the first time in the Bible where God establishes His *berîth* with Abraham: Gen. xv. 3—8 "One born in my house shall *inherit* me... shall not *inherit* thee... he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall *inherit* thee... to give thee this land to *inherit* it... Whereby shall I know that I shall *inherit* it?" In the preceding context, according to our R.V. text, God has promised Himself to Abraham (xv. 1) "I am... thy exceeding great reward." All this is above the level of "compacts" and "agreements" in the ordinary sense of the terms.

There is however no Hebrew noun—whether derived from ירש or otherwise—that represents the "bequeathing," or "testamentary disposition," of an inheritance. The Heb. verb צוה, "give [testamentary] instructions," is represented in Targ. by the Aram. verb פקד in 2 S. xvii. 23, 2 K. xx. 1, Is. xxxviii. 1; but the noun from פקד is not known to occur in Palestinian Aramaic, see below, p. 188, n.

³ Philo i. 587. Comp. Gal. iv. 3 "We were in bondage under the elements (στοιχεῖα) of the world," where however στοιχεῖα probably means "elements" in a metaphorical as well as in a literal sense.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

but to another class through Himself alone, *making Himself the inheritance of those who receive Him.*" All this is based on the utterance of God to Abraham, which Philo reads thus: "And I, behold, [am] my *diathēkē* with thee¹." He adds, as comment, "Now this suggests the following meaning. Though there are very many kinds of *diathēkē*, bestowing kindnesses (*lit.* graces) and free gifts on those who are worthy, yet the highest kind of *diathēkai* I MYSELF AM."

What Philo means—and especially what he means by "free gift" and "grace"—can hardly be understood unless we realise that by *diathēkē* he means, not "covenant" but "testament." By a "testament" a man may leave gifts and legacies to friends, servants, and dependants, but the highest form of it is that by which a father leaves "his real estate" to his son, who is to succeed him after the testator's death. God cannot die. Nevertheless God makes Abraham His "heir," and bequeaths to him, so to speak, His "real estate," His own personal presence, Himself. This conclusion as to Philo's meaning is confirmed by a Latin fragment of a comment of his on God's *diathēkē* with Noah: "In the case of men an inheritance transmitted by them is possessed [by the heir then, and only then] when the men themselves exist no longer but are dead. But on the other hand God, since He is everlasting, *concedes to the wise a joint participation in the inheritance that He transmits [to them while He is still living],* and He rejoices at their entering into possession of it²."

¹ Gen. xvii. 4 καὶ ἐγὼ ἰδοὺ ἡ διαθήκη μου μετὰ σοῦ. This may be variously punctuated. Clem. Alex. 427 quotes ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ (sic) ἡ διαθήκη μου μετὰ σοῦ as a proof that "Moses manifestly calls the Lord a *diathēkē*."

² Philo *Quaest. in Gen.* (on Gen. vi. 18 "I will establish my covenant with thee"). The comment concludes as follows: "Secundo ampliorem quandam largitur sapienti haereditatem. Non enim dixit *Ponam foedus meum tibi*, sed *te*: id est, Tu es justum verumque foedus, quod statuum generi rationali pro possessione ac decore quibus opus est virtutis." I am unable to explain this. The

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

In this last passage, about the *diathēkē* with Noah, we see Philo apparently influenced, partly by the natural meaning of the Greek word (namely, "testament"), and partly by the thought of the subsequent *diathēkē* with Abraham, so that he imports into the transaction with Noah a meaning that the Hebrew can hardly justify. As to the motives of the LXX in using *diathēkē* to render *berīth* we cannot speak confidently. It is possible that they avoided *sunthēkē*, the correct rendering, because the thought of God as making a "compact" or "treaty" with man seemed too anthropomorphic. In the illustrious instances of Noah and Abraham, the LXX may have felt justified in attempting to force into the Hebrew word some higher thought—taking *diathēkē* to mean not exactly a "will" but a "deed of gift." Then this precedent may have been followed by them in subsequent instances, for consistency's sake, where the Hebrew could not have that meaning.

At this stage, after these repeated mentions of "*testament*" in Greek, before we pass to the Gospels, it will be well to ask, "How would a Jew of the first century in Palestine express himself in Aramaic, if he wished to say 'This is my *last will and testament*'?" The answer is important and to some it may be surprising. The Jew could not possibly express this by "This is my *berīth*" any more than we in English could express it by "This is my *treaty*." He would have to say "This is my *diathēkē*," using a Hebraized form of the Greek word. Abundant instances of this use are given by Levy and Krauss. Babylonian Jews might have used another word (apparently of rare occurrence); but Palestinian Jews appear to have had practically no other¹.

heading of the comment is "Quid est Statuam foedus meum tecum?" The expression "I will give [*i.e.* appoint] thee for a covenant" occurs in Isaiah xlii. 6, xlix. 8; but Philo hardly ever quotes prophecy, and there is no various reading of *te* for *tecum* (or *tibi*) in renderings of Gen. vi. 18.

¹ See Levy, Levy *Ch.*, Krauss, and *Thes. Syr.* on דִּי־תִיקִי or

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Now coming to the Epistles we perceive that the Epistle to the Hebrews definitely says "For wherever there is a *diathēkē* there the death of the maker-of-the-*diathēkē* must of necessity have its course (lit. *be brought*), for a *diathēkē* [is as it were] based on dead persons¹." The Epistle to the Galatians takes the *diathēkē* with Abraham expressly out of the region of "law," and by implication out of the region of "compact," into the region of "heirs" and "promise" and "faith," when, after insisting on the unalterableness of a human *diathēkē*², it goes on to say "A *diathēkē* [such as that with Abraham] confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of no effect.... But before faith came we were kept in ward under the law.... And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise³." In the light of these two passages we perceive that elsewhere, when Paul speaks of God's *diathēkē* with Abraham he not only does not include the thought of "compact," but excludes it and implies God's "free gift" (as

דיאָתיקָ used *passim* for "a will." Levy iv. 88 *a* gives one instance of the phrase "a writing of פִּדְיוֹת," i.e. "a writing of last instructions," "a will," in *Git.* 50 *b*. But I am informed by Dr A. Büchler that this is in a discussion of Babylonian scholars and that he knows no instance of it in Palestinian Aramaic. Levy i. 404 quotes, *inter alia*, *J. Berach.* v. 9 *b*, where God is represented as saying that He gave the dew to Abraham "in a *diathēkē*," where Schwab has (p. 101) "C'est à titre *immuable* que j'en ai fait don à Abraham" (comp. *Gal.* iii. 15 foll. on the unalterableness of the *diathēkē* with Abraham). But it means "deed of gift" in *Gen.* i., on *Gen.* xxiv. 10 "All the good[s] of his master was in his hand," where the comment is "This means a *diathēkē*," i.e. a deed of disposition by which Abraham, while still living, made over his property to his servant in trust for Isaac. This is exceptional. Neither here nor elsewhere do Levy's instances indicate that the Hebrew *diathēkē* was used to mean "bargain," "treaty," or "compact."

¹ Heb. ix. 16—17.

² Gal. iii. 15.

³ Gal. iii. 17—29.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Philo does) and the thought of a Father bequeathing an inheritance to sons¹.

In dealing with the Law of Moses Paul labours under great difficulties. The LXX so frequently calls it a *diathēkē* that Paul is obliged to do the same. But he explains it as a testamentary disposition of an inferior character given to Israel for a time—almost as if he were Ishmael not Isaac—for “So long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a bondservant².” This *diathēkē* is both old and new. Relatively to the Christian *diathēkē*, it is old and ready to be superseded. Relatively to the Promise, it is “new,” but not in a good sense—being the *diathēkē* of Sinai, which “beareth children unto bondage,” a novel though necessary makeshift. It cannot invalidate the ancient and unalterable *diathēkē* of God bequeathing Himself to Abraham His son and heir³.

¹ Comp. Rom. ix. 4 “Whose is the adoption and the glory and the *diathēkai*,” ib. xi. 27 “this is the *diathēkē* from me to them (comp. Is. lix. 21) when I shall take away their sins.” The Epistle to the Hebrews (viii. 8—10) quotes Jeremiah (xxxi. 31—3) as predicting that God will make “a new *diathēkē*” for Israel, “I will put my law in their inward parts and in their heart will I write it, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.” This is in Paul’s mind as the true *diathēkē*, the fulfilment of the *diathēkē* with Abraham and Isaac “the heir.” The *diathēkē* of Sinai (Gal. iv. 24) “bearing children unto bondage” is represented by Hagar. That, too, is a legacy of a kind, since Ishmael is Abraham’s child, but it is of an inferior kind.

² Gal. iv. 1.

³ See 2 Cor. iii. 6—14 ἡμᾶς διακόνους καιῆς διαθήκης...ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. Eph. ii. 12 ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, appears to mean “strangers to the *diathēkē* of the promise to Abraham in all the forms in which it was given to him and confirmed to his successors.” For the remaining Pauline instance “this is the new *diathēkē* in my blood” see below, § 42. The instances in the Epistle to the Hebrews—where both meanings are intermixed—are too frequent to be quoted.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 42. "Testament" in the Gospels

Passing now to the Gospels we find that, apart from the narratives of the Eucharist, their evidence is almost entirely negative, since the word occurs but once, namely, in the Song of Zacharias "To remember his holy *diathēkē*, the oath that he swore unto our father Abraham¹." Jesus repeatedly speaks of "the law," but never of the *diathēkē* of God, either with Abraham, or with Israel at Mount Sinai. Nor does any evangelist use the word, when writing in his own person.

In the accounts of the Eucharist the texts vary greatly. The Revised Version gives a longer Lucan text including a phrase that contains the word *diathēkē*, and closely agreeing with a Pauline passage that includes the same phrase². Westcott and Hort give a shorter Lucan text omitting the phrase and containing no mention of *diathēkē*³. Also, in Mark and Matthew, Westcott and Hort reject "new" as applied to *diathēkē*. The Revised Version, although it says that "some ancient authorities" insert *new* in Mark, and that "many" insert it in Matthew, nevertheless does not itself insert *new* in either Gospel.

This omission of "new" makes all the difference in the interpretation of *diathēkē*. If "new" had been part of the text, we might have supposed the meaning to be "This is my blood of the New Covenant, or the blood of my New Covenant, as distinguished from the blood of the Old Covenant which was given to Israel on Mount Sinai." Even with the addition of "new," such a doctrine would seem abrupt and almost startling—especially in view of the fact that Jesus is not

¹ Lk. i. 72—3.

² Lk. xxii. 20 "This cup is the new *diathēkē* in my blood," comp. 1 Cor. xi. 25.

³ W.H. pass from Lk. xxii. 19 "This is my body" to Lk. xxii. 21 "But behold, the hand . . .," bracketing "that is given for you . . . that is shed for you."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

recorded in any Gospel to have ever previously mentioned the word thus interpreted "covenant," either to the multitude or to the disciples. But, without the addition of "new," the meaning "covenant" seems quite impossible.

That being the case, we are led to accept, as probable, an explanation based on the demonstrated meaning of the Palestinian Aramaic word *diathēkē*, namely, "last will and testament." There may possibly have been some allusion to the *diathēkē* in Sinai¹. But much more probably there was no allusion at all to that or to anything else in the Old Testament. It was an utterance of personal affection and of divine conviction. Using the language habitual in Palestine Jesus said to His disciples, "This is the blood that signifies my death and yet not my severance from you. This is the blood of my last will and testament in which, though dying, I bequeath to you my life and presence in perpetuity²."

Here we must add that although Mark and Matthew do not represent Jesus as speaking of a "*new diathēkē*" in connection with "cup" or "blood," they do represent Him as using the word "*new*" in connection with the act of drinking

¹ Comp. Exod. xxiv. 8 ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο Κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων τῶν λόγων τούτων. These words Christians would naturally connect with Christ in after times, as they are connected in Heb. ix. 19, 20 etc. And the tradition peculiar to Luke and added by him a little later on (xxii. 29) καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν... βασιλείαν (perhaps referring to the crown to be gained by the blood of martyrdom) may be an allusion to the διαθήκη of Sinai. But the words of Institution seem best interpreted as a simple, direct, non-allusive and personal utterance in which Jesus bequeathed Himself to His disciples.

² This conclusion—rejecting the word "new"—is compatible with a grateful acknowledgment of the value of the Pauline tradition (1 Cor. xi. 23 "received from the Lord") concerning the meaning of the Eucharist, as being something that was to be "done in remembrance" of the Lord, and also concerning the relation of it, as a "new" and higher "testament," to the old and inferior one. But the Pauline tradition has no claim to be regarded as more faithful than that of Mark and Matthew to Christ's original words.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

from a "cup" at the Eucharist¹. The parallel Luke, though in other respects closely similar to Mark and Matthew, omits "new²." John therefore is bound (according to the Rule of Johannine Intervention) to insert something about "newness," equivalent—from a Johannine point of view—to what Mark and Matthew have about "not drinking from *the offspring of the vine*" until Jesus shall "drink it *new*" in "the kingdom of God" (or, as Matthew has it, "the kingdom of my Father").

Starting, then, from the Synoptic "*offspring of the vine*," we ask for some equivalent in John. Origen, when commenting on "*the offspring of the vine*," in Matthew, asks "What vine?" He replies (from John) "That vine of which He Himself [*i.e.* Jesus] was the figure, saying *I am the Vine, ye the branches*. Whence He says again *My blood is truly drink....* For truly He '*washed His robe in the blood of the grape*³.'"

¹ Mk xiv. 25

Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the offspring of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

Mt. xxvi. 29

But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this offspring of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.

Lk. xxii. 18

For I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the offspring of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.

The columns follow R.V., except in rendering γένημα "offspring" instead of "fruit." The formula for "blessing over the wine" was *Berach. 35 a* (Mishna) "Blessed [is] He that created *the fruit* (פרי) of the vine," and the usual Greek for פרי is καρπός. But in Deut. and Isaiah it is sometimes rendered γένημα.

² Luke has also a corresponding utterance of Jesus about "eating," peculiar to his Gospel (xxii. 16) "I will assuredly not eat it [where "it" refers to (xxii. 15) "this Passover"] until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." There, too, Luke omits "new."

The importance attached to "*the cup*" may be illustrated by the tradition in *Pesach. 106 a* "The Rabbis said that (Exod. xx. 8) *Remember the Sabbath* meant *Remember it over the wine*." This "remembering" was a part of the "Hallowing of the Sabbath," a domestic rite known to have been practised before, and probably long before, the days of Hillel and Shammai.

³ Origen *Levit. Hom. vii. 2* (Lomm. ix. 292—3) quoting Mt. xxvi.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Now all would agree that the blood of Jesus represents His "love" ("greater *love* hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends¹"). And the love of Jesus is regarded in the Fourth Gospel as a new kind of love. At the conclusion of His prayer to the Father for the disciples, Jesus says that He will make the Father's name known to them, "that *the love wherewith thou lovedst* me may be in them, and I in them²"; and He has previously defined this love in "a new commandment" to the disciples. Their love is to be like His love: "*A new commandment* give I unto you, that ye love one another—even as *I have loved* you, that ye also love one another³."

Does not this "new commandment," in John, correspond to the "new wine," in Mark and Matthew? That the epithet "new" is emphatic is confirmed, not only by the context, but also by the play on "new" and "old" in the Johannine Epistle⁴, and by the fact that, apart from narrative, this is the only instance of the epithet in the whole of the Fourth Gospel⁵. Some may object that "commandment" implies constraint. "Love," they may say, "must not be commanded." That is not an objection that would be felt to be a serious one by John or by any spiritually-minded Jew, who would accept as God's gifts the two "great" commandments of the Law. God's commandments are affectionate imperatives, like the Pauline paraphrase "Be ye reconciled unto God⁶." They come to us

29, Jn xv. 5, vi. 55, Gen. xlix. 11. Comp. *Didach.* § 9 "First, about the *cup*:—We give thanks to thee, our Father, for the holy *Vine* of David thy servant (*παῖδός*), which thou madest known to us through Jesus thy servant (*παῖδός*)."

¹ Jn xv. 13.

² Jn xvii. 26.

³ Jn xiii. 34. There would be nothing "new" in the commandment "love your neighbours," or "love one another," but there was something "new" in the kind of love.

⁴ The commandment was (1 Jn ii. 7) "not new" and yet (*ib.* 8) "on the other hand new."

⁵ Jn xix. 4 "a new tomb" is the only other instance.

⁶ 2 Cor. v. 20.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

appealing for love—love toward God the Father, and love toward men the brethren. And, coming to us through the Son, they convey to us, if we will receive them in the Spirit of the Son, a power to respond to the appeal. Hence, in the Fourth Gospel, a “commandment” is regarded as something “given” by the Father to the Son, and even as being “eternal life¹.” The final mention of the word by Jesus indicates, so to speak, an appropriation of the Commandment of Love by the Son: “This is my very own commandment, that ye love one another².” By using “commandment” and not the ambiguous *diathēkē*, John avoids all notion of “covenanting” or “bargaining.” And yet he also avoids any expressions that imply unconditional “giving” to those who are incapable of “receiving” the gift.

No Gospel inculcates more consistently than the Fourth the necessity of something real at heart and spiritually solid, incompatible with nebulous mysticism or inflated bubbles of profession. Conditions—of act as well as thought—are not only expressed but also reiterated. “If ye have love one to another,” and “If ye do that which I command you,” are but two out of many specimens³. Our expectation, then, that John would intervene—so far as concerns the Marcan tradition, certainly omitted by Luke, about the “newness” of the wine that was to be drunk by Jesus after His death—appears to be justified. We have no right to push our expectation further and to claim that John should intervene about the Marcan *diathēkē* to tell us whether it meant “testament” or “covenant.” For, as we have seen, it is not certain that Luke omits this word.

Nevertheless we may say with confidence that, all through Christ's Last Discourse and Last Prayer, John is endeavouring

¹ Jn xii. 49, 50.

² Jn xv. 12. On the emphasis of ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ ἐμή see *Joh. Gr.*, Index ἐμή.

³ See εἰς in Jn xiii. 17, 35, xiv. 15, 23, xv. 7, 10, 14.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

to set before us the Son as playing (so to speak) the part of a Testator in behalf of the Father. In the Father's name, He is bequeathing Himself to mankind. The difficulty pointed out by Philo—that God the Father cannot die, so as to make a "testament" in the ordinary way—disappears in the Person of the incarnate Son. The Son could die. Since He could die He could make a "testament" as Mark and Matthew apparently say that He did. The difficulty for John, therefore, consisted, not in the actual words of Jesus, but in the interpretations of them by Christians, who might confuse "testament" with "covenant," or might give to both terms formal and unspiritual significations.

In the Fourth Gospel this danger is avoided partly by negative means—by avoiding the word "testament." But far more importance attaches to the positive means—the introduction of a substitute that could not possibly be reduced to the level of a technical term. This substitute—which reminds us of the promise to Abraham as interpreted above, "And I, behold, [am] my *diathēkē* with thee"—is a personal Testament, a Paraclete, an Alter Ego, or Second Self, who is to represent the Son after His departure and to recall the Son's acts and words and strengthening presence, with increased power. Thus, without hearing from His lips any such words as "This is my testament," we see Jesus in this Gospel standing in the midst of His troubled followers on the eve of His departure from them, and bestowing on them a Testament of a new kind, no less "new" than His love, a Testament indeed yet not a writing, a spiritual Friend to take His place in their orphaned hearts, and to breathe into them the assurance that although absent He is present and that they are not orphans in the comfort of His perpetual presence: "Peace I leave unto you, my own peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth give I unto you." "I will not leave you orphans, I come unto you¹."

¹ In xiv. 27, 18.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

PUBLISHED BY ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.

CLUE: A Guide through Greek to Hebrew
Scripture (Diatessarica—Part I).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (post free 7s. 10d.)

THE CORRECTIONS OF MARK (Diatessarica—Part II).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 15s. net. (post free 15s. 5d.)

FROM LETTER TO SPIRIT (Diatessarica—Part III).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 20s. net. (post free 20s. 5d.)

PARADOSIS (Diatessarica—Part IV).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (post free 7s. 10d.)

JOHANNINE VOCABULARY (Diatessarica—Part V).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 13s. 6d. net. (post free 13s. 10d.)

JOHANNINE GRAMMAR (Diatessarica—Part VI).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 16s. 6d. net. (post free 16s. 11d.)

SILANUS THE CHRISTIAN.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (post free 7s. 10d.)

APOLOGIA: An Explanation and Defence.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net. (post free 2s. 10d.)

NOTES ON NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM

(Diatessarica—Part VII).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (post free 7s. 10d.)

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

PUBLISHED BY ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.

INDICES TO DIATESSARICA.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net. (post free 2s. 10d.)

THE MESSAGE OF THE SON OF MAN.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 4s. 6d. net. (post free 4s. 10d.)

PUBLISHED BY THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

THE SON OF MAN (Diatessarica—Part VIII).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 16s. 6d. net. (post free 17s.)

LIGHT ON THE GOSPEL FROM AN ANCIENT POET

(Diatessarica—Part IX).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 12s. 6d. net. (post free 12s. 11d.)

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL, INTRODUCTION

(Diatessarica—Part X, Section I).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net. (post free 2s. 10d.)

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (I).

Demy 8vo, Wrapped, Price 2s. net. (post free 2s. 2d.)

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL, THE BEGINNING

(Diatessarica—Part X, Section II).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 12s. 6d. net. (post free 12s. 11d.)

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL, THE PROCLAMATION
OF THE NEW KINGDOM

(Diatessarica—Part X, Section III).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 12s. 6d. net. (post free 12s. 11d.)

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

66/30 226R
Abbott, E. A. D.D. AB26

Miscellanea Evangelica I + II

226R
Ab 26

66/30

